PRAYER AS AN INTEGRATING PROCESS

A Professional Project

Presented to

the Faculty of the

School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Ministry

by

George B. Thompson, Jr.

May 1978

This professional project, completed by

_____George B. Thompson, Jr._____,

has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty
of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

_____

_____

_____

Feb. 13, 1978

_____
Date

Joseph C. Hough, Jr.

_____
Dean

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people have assisted my work on this project by reading and commenting on parts of it at various stages: Jack Keller, Jr.; Hunt Beyer; Becky Beyer; my father, George Thompson, Sr.; Elizabeth Kemp of York, England; and Carey Gifford. Carolyn Stahl read chapter one and stimulated my thinking on the project as it was finally formulated; she has helped me in many ways. Professor Cobb helped me fumble through the stages of clarifying ideas and urged me to write when I thought that I was not ready. He has advised and encouraged me well. My wife, Linda, part-time typist, proofreader and think tank, deserves an endurance award, as do all spouses of graduate students. The award is for enduring the program, for she more than endured me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This project brings together aspects of four different topics: prayer, process theology (based upon Alfred North Whitehead's philosophy of organism, or process philosophy), charismatic tongue-speaking and personal integration. To my knowledge, no published literature exists which deals with these topics in any similar way. My attempt has been to lay a metaphysically-based theological understanding of prayer which takes account of many fairly recent "movements," such as charismatic re- newal, environmental awareness, wholistic thinking and process thought. More specifically, my aim is to explain, using categories from process philosophy and theology, how prayer can be used as a means of integrat- ing all aspects of oneself. These aspects are identified in the project as "spirit," "soul," "body" and "action." They are intended to eluci- date the all-encompassing nature and function of what I perceive life to be; hence, detailed discussion of these aspects is less significant than the overall scheme to which they witness and in which they participate. The purpose of Chapter One is to make clear what this means in general terms from a Whiteheadian, process theological perspective, relying largely upon John B. Cobb, Jr.'s work.

Chapter Two builds upon the understanding of integration devel- oped in Chapter One and suggests how prayer can be understood in this process perspective. The importance of one's beliefs about God is em- phasized. Next, a process view of God is sketched out, which leads into a discussion of a process view of prayer. On the basis of all these re- marks, then, I propose and describe the concept, "integrative prayer."

In order to demonstrate the use of integrative prayer, Chapter Three develops an understanding of tongue-speaking as a means for an integrative prayer style. This involves, first, summaries and comments upon views of tongue-speaking by charismatics and social science researchers. A process interpretation is then outlined, based upon my conclusion that tongue-speaking is not natural, human language. I also suggest how tongue-speaking might be used in a practice of integrative prayer. My theories center upon the elicitation of nonconscious contents as a necessary part of the integrative process.

Because integrative prayer is my major concern, I show in Chapter Four that there are other means available today which can also be utilized for integrative prayer. These are discussed briefly and their different possibilities suggested. The ones which are discussed are meditation and meditation techniques, study of one's own dreams, guided imagery meditation and biofeedback. I comment on similarities and contrasts which these four have with tongue-speaking. In the last few pages I discuss how these might be used in a local church. Some attention is given to church leadership, programming, and four aspects of local church life: worship, education, pastoral care and mission.

INTRODUCTION

This project has grown over the past three years, only gradually developing into the convergence of topics which constitute its content. My interest goes back even farther, into my earlier college days, when both process thought and the charismatic movement were shaping my conceptuality and understanding of Christian faith. It was not until my senior year that the incongruities between the two reached a crisis point. I made a decision, after a period of difficult events and inner wrestlings. The decision was that I could open up to a wider dimension of thinking and questing and still remain genuinely Christian. The use of my mental and other faculties did not demand that I had to become less of what God wanted me to become. At the same time, though, it introduced risk: the risk of doubt, of freedom without responsibility, of waning zeal to know and do the will of God. It was risk that I needed to take, and I was ready, even eager, to do it.

For those whose spiritual development has taken them through similar crises, it is not hard to understand that the first phase of my new spiritual orientation was characterized by "not"s. I knew what God was <u>not</u>, what Christ was <u>not</u>, what the Bible was <u>not</u>, what prayer was <u>not</u>. This phase began before I graduated from college and carried through into my first seminary years, much to the consternation of some members of my home church in Claremont. I think that it is drawing to a close now; I hope that this project is evidence of that.

Of course, I could not cram into one professional project all the ideas and information which I am now learning to use to declare my

faith affirmatively. In one sense, I regret that Biblical study plays no major role in this project, for it has been one of my keen interests for many years. What _have_ I ended up with here?

First of all, I chose to study at the School of Theology at Claremont because my (formerly dormant) interest in process theology had vigorously sprouted. I decided early that whatever I did for this project, it would include some aspect of process metaphysics. In my second year, I did a paper on tongue-speaking for the Advanced Seminar in Process Thought. The work on that paper called for a lot of creative thought, some of which was eventually reflected in this project.

Whitehead's thought had sparked my interest in holistic think-ing, so I took "Spirit-Mind-Body-Action Integration" my third year. During that class I realized that I was interested in putting this top-ic together with process theology and my work on tongue-speaking. But how? Sometime during that semester, the answer came to me, although I do not remember the occasion. I realized, finally, that prayer was one of the vital aspects of my earlier spiritual orientation. Since tongue-speaking is considered prayer, it appeared possible to develop the pro-ject along the lines of prayer as an integrating process. Then I could discuss tongue-speaking as an illustration of the general development. The last chapter, based upon work in the Integration class, grew out of the need to put tongue-speaking in context with other approaches which I felt bore similar potential. In other words, this is not a project about tongue-speaking, it is about integrative prayer. Perhaps one way to state my thesis is to say that Christian faith involves all of who we are and what we do, and, properly understood, prayer can be a highly

efficacious means of developing more fully that totality which is each of us. I think that I make fairly clear at every step along the way what I mean in particular.

It is my earnest hope that this project can be utilized by others in a variety of ways, as a way to "spread abroad Scriptural holiness," to the glory of God, the Creator, Sustainer and "integrator" of us all.

CHAPTER 1

A WHITEHEADIAN UNDERSTANDING OF INTEGRATION,

SPIRIT-SOUL-BODY-ACTION

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the courses which I took during my study at the School
of Theology at Claremont was entitled "Spirit-Mind-Body-Action Integra-
tion." It was taught by Carolyn Stahl, Coordinator of Spiritual Life
for Project Burning Bush at the School. The purpose of this course was
to introduce the student to various approaches for living out an inte-
grated view of life. Each of the approaches that we studied--most of
them quite modern in form--emphasized different aspects: one focused
upon the proper relationship of the body to itself; others centered on
a transcendent aspect, or mentality/consciousness. A few of these at-
tempted more synthetic means, trying to understand "body-mind-spirit"
as some kind of unity which needs all aspects considered and harmonized.

I studied these integrative styles with much interest. During
this time, it became clear to me that, if my process philosophical ori-
entation was to be relevant, it must be possible to understand "inte-
gration" in these terms. It was also clear to me that, if it had truth
in it, the concept of integration must be incorporated into my process
understanding of Christian faith. These two needs guided my work on
this project.

Most approaches to integration lack clarification of the meta-
physical presuppositions from which their view of integration is

understood. It will become clear to the reader that I believe that such clarity is very necessary. In this chapter, I develop from Alfred North Whitehead's philosophy of organism an understanding of what integration is and how it functions.

Various contemporary sources offer clues which suggest, at least vaguely and in their own ways, that the unity of all reality is more fundamental than the more dominant, Western sense of separateness. This is the theme of many books on ecology and environmental awareness, such as Only One Earth.[1] Robert E. Ornstein draws upon experimental psychology and Eastern meditative traditions. He proposes that there are two modes of consciousness--one, linear and analytical; the other holistic and intuitive--and that these two modes must be balanced in a person.[2] Claudio Naranjo argues that "the essence of meditation is also the essence of everything else: art, philosophy, religion, life. . . . Everything is the same, and everything is different."[3] In addition to these more modern formulations, there are also many clues in the Christian tradition. One more recent expression comes from Thomas Merton, in his study of prayer in monasticism. These three statements characterize his perspective on the nature and value of contemplative prayer:

In reality the monk abandons the world only in order to listen more intently to the deepest and most neglected voices that proceed from

---

[1]Rene Dubos and Barbara Ward, Only One Earth (New York: Norton, 1972).

[2]Robert E. Ornstein, The Psychology of Consciousness (New York: Penguin Books, 1975).

[3]Claudio Naranjo and Robert Ornstein, On the Psychology of Meditation (New York: Viking Press, 1971), p. 132.

its inner depth.[4]

Meditation has no point and no reality unless it is firmly rooted in <u>life</u>.[5]

The love of others is a stimulus to interior life, not a danger to it, as some mistakenly believe.[6]

On the basis of these brief references, I suggest that "integration" can be at least generally understood as "the harmonious functioning of every aspect of human selfhood." One purpose of this chapter is to show that a Whiteheadian view of integration demonstrates particularly what Whitehead's philosophy is generally. This purpose will be demonstrated in the context of developing said Whiteheadian perspective. Thus, the following pages suggest that kind of particular clarity which is eventually necessary in a more detailed application of Whitehead's thought to any topic. What follows are some major notions from Whitehead's philosophy of organism which lend themselves most readily to explicating the meaning of integration.

First, a point of orientation may be helpful. Whitehead's philosophy develops interdependently; that is, each idea relies upon the others, in order for the scheme to emerge in correct perspective. Because of this characteristic, the 'parts' require the 'whole' for their proper understanding. The discussion in this chapter specifically utilizes John Cobb, Jr.'s book, <u>A</u> <u>Christian</u> <u>Natural</u> <u>Theology</u>.[7] (Cobb

---

[4]Thomas Merton, <u>Contemplative</u> <u>Prayer</u> (Garden City: Doubleday, 1969), p. 23.

[5]Ibid., p. 39.   [6]Ibid., p. 40.

[7]John B. Cobb, Jr., <u>A</u> <u>Christian</u> <u>Natural</u> <u>Theology</u> (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965). Cited as <u>CNT</u>.

concisely and systematically explains certain basic notions from White-
head, pointing out where he agrees, disagrees, and where he moves beyond
Whitehead to venture further speculation or explanation.) However, my
knowledge of Whitehead's thought is not dependent only upon this and
other secondary sources.

II. ACTUAL OCCASIONS AND GOD

The central doctrine of Whitehead's metaphysical conceptuality
is that reality is of one kind, which he termed "actual occasions."
Cobb explains:

> The actual entities are the finally real things, the ultimate
> individuals. Apart from them there is nothing at all. The whole
> of the philosophy is an analysis of such entities and their rela-
> tions with each other.[8]

Whitehead called this notion the "ontological principle."[9] An actual
occasion is a 'puff of existence'; it is a definite and specific becom-
ing of the world. It begins its "becoming" by receiving, from the oc-
casions which have preceded it, the entire past of the universe. Most
of that past is received trivially and is of no practical consequence
to the becoming occasion. However, each datum from the past is grasped,
and in a particular way. Then the occasion harmonizes these "feelings"
with its own aim (and God's, which is discussed below), having several
real possibilities for how it will become. The occasion then becomes
definite--"concresces" in Whitehead's terminology--and immediately is a

---

[8]Ibid., p. 38. Cf.Alfred North Whitehead, _Process_ and _Reality_
(New York: Macmillan, 1929), pp. 33ff. Cited as PR.

[9]PR, p. 37.

datum for new occasions. All this happens in a single moment that is divisible only in analysis.[10] Note that each actual occasion is a unity--a definite, particular and unique harmonization of the world.

God's relationship to the becoming of actual occasions is very important. For Whitehead, God is a metaphysical necessity.[11] God is why there is anything at all; as Cobb states: "God must be conceived as being the reason that entities occur at all as well as determining the limits within which they can achieve their own forms."[12] The data of the past which the occasion feels include God. God is present in the becoming occasion as an "initial aim," an ideal which the occasion 'considers' as it becomes. Cobb explains how the initial aim and the occasion relate to each other:

> The initial aim is given to the occasion. It points that occasion toward an ideal possibility for its satisfaction. But it does so in terms of gradations of possible realization. The actual occasion is not compelled to actualize some one of these possibilities.[13]

Compulsion, strictly speaking, is impossible, because the occasion's own "subjective aim" is its own final reason for becoming what the occasion will become. Cobb elucidates the nature and function of the subjective aim:

> . . . during the successive phases of the occasion's self-actualization as it compares and harmonizes the data it has received from the world, it also modifies and adapts its subjective aim. The self-determination of its own aim is the final locus of freedom within the limits of causal force as determined by the settled past and the principle of order inherent in its initial aim.[14]

---

[10]The preceding discussion comes from Cobb, ch. I, sec. 2.

[11]See CNT, ch. IV, sec. 4, for a discussion of this point.

[12]CNT, p. 211.   [13]CNT, p. 96.   [14]Ibid.

In its becoming, the occasion aims not only for its own satisfaction but also for that future which it is able to anticipate. This is Whitehead's metaphysical basis for most of morality.[15] To summarize and clarify the major point of this paragraph: God is an essential influence and factor for every actual occasion; in both similar and different ways, so also is the past and the occasion's own aim.

Whitehead insists that each actual occasion is novel, rather than a mere repetition of the past. Even the occasions which tend mainly to repeat their predecessors are something new.[16] This fact is due chiefly to the freedom of self-determination which each occasion has (see quote 14). However, freedom always has limitations, namely, "the totality of the world as it has been down to the moment of the becoming of the new occasion." The way that the new occasion feels each occasion of that past is its freedom.[17] Therefore, both freedom and past influence are actual experiences for an occasion.[18] If integration is to be understood in Whitehead's perspective, it must include this understanding of the relationship between both freedom and the past as they jointly constitute the becoming of actual occasions.

Whitehead's philosophy is attempting to explain how it is possible to make sense out of our experience of both diversity and unity in the world. This is characteristic in his thought.[19] The cutting edge for his approach lies in the analysis of the actual occasion. This

---

[15]PR, p. 41.   [16]See CNT, p. 214.

[17]This sentence and previous quote from CNT, p. 95.

[18]CNT, p. 39.   [19]CNT, p. 60.

analysis differs from the traditional subject-object schema of Western philosophy. For Whitehead, an actual occasion is both: as a subject it is concrescing, and as an object it is definite, immediately becoming a datum of the past.[20] As we have seen, reality is the process of the becoming of actual occasions. If integration is to be understood in these Whiteheadian terms, then integration is part of this process of becoming.

III. HUMAN SELFHOOD

The discussion so far may seem confusing; you and I never consciously experience just one actual occasion, but only a society of occasions. A society is a group of occasions, with the condition that it has "some common trait exemplified by each of its members in dependence on some of the others."[21] The degree of complexity or organization of such societies becomes even more complex in their relationships with other societies. However, such a discussion is not necessary for the purposes here.[22] The main point is that these societies account, in their many various types and complexities, for the physical world as we perceive it with our physical senses. An important distinction to remember is that the societies themselves are inert and passive, having no experience. The actual occasion is properly the only category of reality which is subjective and active.[23]

---

[20]CNT, p. 44   [21]CNT, p. 40.

[22]See CNT, Ch. I, sec. 3 for an introductory discussion. Cf. PR, pt. I, ch. 3, sec. II for Whitehead's initial discussion of societies.

[23]Ibid., pp. 44-45.

A particular example of this relationship between societies and occasions is the human person. The body consists of many societies—those of the organs, the nervous system, skin, hair, etc. These are each essential in their various functions. However, there is in the person some process of unitary coordination always functioning. This process does have subjectivity. For Whitehead, this subjective process forms a society of actual occasions, known as the "dominant occasions" of the body. Whitehead calls this particular society "the human soul." In the following passage, Whitehead summarizes the relationship between the body and its "presiding occasion":

> Thus in an animal the presiding occasion, if there be one, is the final node, or intersection, of a complex structure of many enduring objects. Such a structure pervades the human body. The harmonized relations of the parts of the body constitute this wealth of inheritance into a harmony of contrasts, issuing into intensity of experience. The inhibitions of opposites have been adjusted into the contrasts of opposites. The human mind is thus conscious of its body inheritance.[24]

The understanding of the nature and function of the soul tends to be a major focal point in the current discussions of integration. Therefore, let us examine it further, in light of Whitehead's thought.

Each occasion of the human soul conforms to all principles to which any other actual occasion conforms. Cobb summarizes the nature of actual occasions in the following statement: "Each occasion is a synthesis of the universe as it is grasped from that perspective and contributes to the universe its own definiteness of synthesis or satisfaction."[25] The human soul can be defined as "that society composed

---

[24]PR, pp. 166-67.   [25]CNT, p. 55.

of all the momentary occasions of experience that make up the life history of the [person]."[26] The soul is distinctive because it functions as the reigning society of the body. It is also distinctive because its occasions enjoy consciousness, a characteristic not found in most occasions. One of Whitehead's important assertions for our understanding of integration is: "The principle that I am adopting is that consciousness presupposes experience, and not experience consciousness."[27] Consciousness is not common to all actual occasions because it requires special circumstances. Cobb explains:

> . . . it occurs only where a high level of mentality or originality is present. Further it depends upon a complex integration of conceptual and physical feelings involving highly developed contrasts.[28]

Whitehead believes that the dominant occasion's ability for consciousness gives it a very great potential for novelty, change, becoming new and different from the past. Consciousness allows the contrast of what _is_ with what _might_ _be_. This ability offers much potential for a person to integrate newness. This difference in degree (not kind) from other actual occasions is a major and important one.[29] Persons actually _do_ have the innate ability to change, because it is inherent in the process of reality. Therefore, it can be claimed that awareness of one's freedom and potential for newness can aid one's ability to change for the better.

Yet there is another side to the nature of the soul. Remember

---

[26]_CNT_, p. 48.   [27]_CNT_, p. 83.

[28]_CNT_, p. 49.   [29]See _CNT_, p. 96.

that consciousness is a special feature, found only in certain occasions, the human soul being a society of such occasions. Whitehead recognized that most of what constitutes the human dominant occasion (the soul) is unconscious. On this point he agrees with depth psychology.[30] Much psychiatry, psychology and counseling functions with the recognition that persons must reckon with this aspect of themselves. Cobb, then, is staying consonant with Whitehead's scheme in suggesting that contemplation of one's "inner life" might be entirely appropriate:

> . . . the individual depends radically upon the society of other souls. But provisionally there may be every reason to retract from the complexity of the environment into one's own interior life so that one may be better able to be enriched by the larger world.[31]

A Whiteheadian integration of life will deal in part with the unconscious in ways which will allow it to enhance, not inhibit, integration. The goal is greater responsiveness to God's initial aims, which involves all of oneself, not just consciousness.

Thus far, the discussion has attempted to present, in brief form, Whitehead's understanding of the human person in the context of his cosmological scheme. We have examined the process of the becoming of actual occasions, the past and self-determination, freedom and novelty, societies of occasions and the human person as body-soul. We have seen that the occasions making up the person are quite diverse in their characteristics but rely upon each other for continuing harmony. Discord which is felt within and among the occasions can lead to 'physical disruption,' with 'psychological' effects, or 'psychological disruption'

---

[30]CNT, p. 80.   [31]CNT, p. 56.

with 'physical' effects. However, integration requires novelty and novelty must risk discord. Through this process in the person, the seat for continued, growing, potential harmony is the human soul. The metaphysical fact of its 'perception' of the possibilities for the future in view of the past and present is the basis of the soul's power to aim for specific changes. If a person is sensitive to God, such changes would give greater importance to God's aim for the person to become the very best that is possible in that moment. God's initial aims for the soul's occasions can and do include an 'urge' from God to recognize and/or take action in a healing way with significant aspects of a person's past. Thus, the Whiteheadian perspective underscores the possibility that change can happen, because the past does not rule the future.

IV. THE LARGER WORLD AND THE INFLUENCE OF BELIEF

Emphasis thus far has focused upon the person within him/herself. Yet some of the above ideas have already suggested that Whitehead's perspective considers such a focus only partly true to the nature of reality. Let me clarify this point. Actual occasions take account of the world both in their "physical poles"--as they feel those data in particular ways--and in their "mental poles"--as they come to definiteness in one of the several ways possible to them.[32] It is in the mental pole that each actual occasion comes to 'completion,' not just to satisfy itself, but also in consideration of how it perceives

---

[32]For further discussion of these terms "mental pole" and "physical pole," see CNT, pp. 30ff.

the possibilities for the future.[33] In other words, as Cobb says, "absolute self-interest is metaphysically impossible!"[34] With reference to humans, one's dominant occasion will therefore always take account of how one will relate to the world.

Despite this metaphysical reality, however, our experience as persons strongly suggests that self-interest, at times, certainly dominates people's lives. A further metaphysically-based characteristic must also function, so that the impossibility of absolute self-interest becomes evident and influential in and for us. This characteristic is another unique aspect of human persons; it involves consciousness and self-awareness. Cobb writes: "Only where consciousness eventuates in self-awareness and self-awareness comes to include awareness of a choosing among alternatives do we arrive at clear instances of moral choice."[35] The human person is always making choices as each dominant occasion becomes. (Remember that this process is mostly unconscious.) This becoming accounts for the influence of the past, God's aims for the occasion, the latter's own aim and anticipation of how the future might become. Thus, for Whitehead, inward experience and action in the world are radically conceived as inseparably related on the metaphysical level. A person who is harmoniously functioning in all aspects, then, is 'becoming' in ways which help other actual occasions become harmonious and, therefore, better integrated. These 'other occasions' include, of course, the 'natural world" as well as other human beings.

---

[33]See PR, p. 41, and page 5 of this project.

[34]CNT, p. 109.   [35]CNT, p. 97.

Our experience as persons also shows that, even with self-awareness of choice, we still make decisions which do not enhance our personal integration, or which do not help the world improve. This happens, in part, because structures of belief have such pervasive effects upon how we interpret what we experience. Robert E. Ornstein makes this point both on a physiological and a psychological basis.[36] An obvious example of such an effect is in the use of playing cards whose red and black scheme has been reversed, so that hearts and diamonds are black and spades are red. The common error is that most people do not immediately recognize that they are not seeing those figures as they are normally colored. Another example which happens fairly often to me is 'reading' misspelled words correctly on a term paper rough draft. Both cases illustrate that what one expects to experience can lead one into clearly erroneous interpretations of the experience itself. In addition, they demonstrate that belief functions often on an unconscious level.

Cobb makes a statement about the effect of belief upon religious experience which I believe can be generalized for other kinds of belief. He says:

> Belief can have a profound effect upon our understanding of ourselves even when no conscious experience of God is present, and for the great majority of believers such belief is probably dominant in the formation of their religious lives.[37]

I am persuaded that a person who aims for the harmonious functioning of all aspects of her/his selfhood can easily have misconceptions about

---

[36]Ornstein, Chapter 2.   [37]CNT, p. 246.

the nature of reality. These misconceptions, often not conscious ones, will incorrectly interpret experiences which, in this case, the person deems to be major aspects of the integrative process. Because they are a central element for the integrative process, we need to examine our beliefs and how they influence our interpretations of our experience. Cobb sees a need for an interplay between the two: "Experienced interpretation and interpreted experience need each other for their mutual completion and correction."[38] This point applies to the relationships between all aspects of selfhood--spirit, soul, body and action.

V. SUMMARY

We need to summarize the points of this chapter and bring together the argument for a Whiteheadian view of integration. First, it is in the basis of all reality that all things are related to each other, albeit some more intensely, some less so. Integration is a particular example of one aspect of such relatedness. Second, reality is process, the becoming and perishing of actual occasions; so integration, too, is a process--one which never ends. Third, reality always involves purpose, deriving partly from the subjective aim of each occasion, but especially from the initial aim from God, which offers to the occasion the very best (along with less) possibilities for its becoming. In its concrescence, the occasion aims both to satisfy itself and also to 'take into consideration' the real possibilities for the future, as it 'perceives' the future. Integrative purpose always includes the good of

---

[38]Ibid.

other occasions, as well as that can be understood, while also consider-
ing the best possibility for oneself at that moment.

The fourth summary point concerns the human person. S/he is
vastly complex but wondrously harmonized in function. The many complex
societies which constitute the body are presided over by a dominant
actual occasion, the human soul. Distinct in its great potential for
freedom and consciousness, it is yet mainly unconscious, the storehouse
of the person's past. With such potential, the human soul can con-
sciously aim to change ways of becoming which are habitual.[39] Novelty
is here at its highest potential, largely based in the soul's freedom.
Furthermore, greater integration will be possible by consciously aiming
to be more sensitive and responsive to each initial aim from God.

With this explicitly process view of human existence, then, in-
tegration can be understood to be the ongoing actualization of height-
ening one's experience of being unity within diversity, giving necessary
attention to the various aspects of selfhood. Each aspect needs atten-
tion and development, for the purpose of evermore complex harmony among
them. The aim is to cooperate with the movement of reality, which is
proceeding toward greater and greater harmony and intensity. This move-
ment is 'located' in God, the poet of the world. Integration requires
a more 'informed' person, who understands the nature of reality and,
therefore, of integration. This understanding is both conscious and
and intuitive--that is, on deeper levels of selfhood as well. Then the
person can act from this knowledge, as it develops, better able to

---

[39]Ibid., p. 249.

integrate her/himself, with greater consideration also given to the needs of the rest of the world.[40]

Such integration, I believe, is not fully possible without faith. Whitehead does not speak about such a necessity metaphysically, but he lends himself to it in many passages throughout his books. It seems to me more than appropriate to put my trust in the One always aiming for my and the world's very best. Whitehead wrote:

> The power of God is the worship He inspires. That religion is strong which in its ritual and its modes of thought evokes an apprehension of ,he commanding vision. The worship of God is not a rule of safety--it is an adventure of the spirit, a flight after the unattainable. The death of religion comes with the repression of the high hope of adventure.[41]

There is much that one could say about this passage. It will suffice for our purposes to say that here is ample evidence that the God who continually calls us to "the high hope of adventure"--including integrating our spirits, souls, bodies and actions--is no stranger to Christian faith.

---

[40]See Cobb's ethical principle in _CNT_, p. 124.

[41]Alfred North Whitehead, _Science and the Modern World_ (New York: Free Press, 1967), p. 192.

CHAPTER 2

GOD, PRAYER, AND UNIFYING LIFE

Chapter One argued, in part, that discussion of what unifying life (integration) means can be clarified in the context of a new world view which more accurately takes account of our experience of reality. Process philosophy is such a worldview. Furthermore, my argument has been that process philosophy--the philosophy or organism--is a philosophy of integration. To discuss life integration, from a process perspective, is to discuss in particular what process philosophy and theology are about generally. Chapter One also argued that God is necessary to reality. Can that claim, or a similar one, be made about prayer? This is a pertinent question to which we now address our attention.

I. OBSTACLES TO PRAYER

Perhaps the importance of this question can be better understood if considered in the light of some common problems which prayer faces. Several issues and questions about life recur throughout the centuries and cause no end of discomfort to many devout and thoughtful people. Some of these have to do with whether or not God exists or can be proved to exist. There are people who have studied the traditional arguments for God's existence but are not convinced. For those who are, or who do not need to be, convinced, there is then the question of whether God can be both all-powerful and all-loving. This question leads quickly to the problem of good and evil; why is it that some evil

people are successful while many good ones are miserable? "If God is God, he is not good/If God is good, he is not God," is the line which one of Job's friends tells him in Archibald Macleish's play, J.B. Some people who deny the value of prayer hide behind intellectual facades, even though the issue for them is a moral demand which they feel unwilling to fulfill. Perhaps the most difficult traditional problem facing prayer is that people are too lazy to do it.[1] I will confess to that charge!

These traditional hindrances to active prayer life have been around in one form or another since before the time of Jesus. In addition, the twentieth century has seen the emergence of two further obstacles to prayer. The first of these is the modern world view which understands nature to be evolutionary. Creation, to address the world theologically, is an ongoing process, never static or complete. Furthermore, evidence suggests that experimentation happens in nature, and some--perhaps many--of these new creatures cannot survive. (It should be noted that process philosophy builds part of its case upon evolution.) Secondly, the modern person must face the complex new understanding of human selfhood as introduced by depth psychology. For example, Freud considered prayer an illusory, childish practice based upon fulfilling needs from the unconscious. In addition to these two modern perspectives, logical positivism is a contemporary philosophical stance which does not consider the possibility of reality beyond the

---

[1]These points are taken from John R. Yungblut, Rediscovering Prayer (New York: Seabury Press, 1972), pp. 5-6.

physical senses.   Similarly, with the great advances in modern medi-
cine and disease prevention, the age-old practice of intercession for
healing seems, for us today, superfluous at best.[2]

Not only is the practice of prayer in serious question, but
many aspects of twentieth-century life point to the need for a new
world view. This world view must be able to account for these more in-
volved understandings of life and reality. The recognition of this
need is, of course, that with which process thinkers begin in develop-
ing their ideas. It is significant, though, to note that other writers
have also discussed this need; one of these is Gerald Heard.[3] One log-
ical outcome of such inquiry into new metaphysics is the examination of
current conceptions of God.[4] The essential pertinence that the nature
of God has for the practice of prayer should not be underestimated,
for, as Norman Pittenger has said, "The way in which we see man's com-
munion with God will be determined very largely by how we think of God
himself."[5] In my own personal development, this point has been of im-
mense significance, and I hope to utilize it effectively later on in
this chapter.

---

[2]See Yungblut, pp. 6-11, for elaboration of these points.

[3]Gerald Heard, A Preface to Prayer (New York: Harper & Bro-
thers, 1944); see especially pp. 125-131.

[4]As Yungblut also points out, p. 15.

[5]Norman Pittenger, God's Way With Men (Valley Forge: Judson
Press, 1969), p. 39. I will attempt to use nonsexist language in my
own writing.

II. A PROCESS CONCEPTION OF GOD

Our next area for inquiry, then, is a process understanding of the God to whom the modern person prays. Many of the general concepts have been discussed in the first chapter, with regard to God's function as the source of purpose, novelty and becoming of all actual occasions. Before continuing further, let us briefly review the process understanding of the world in which we live and in and through which God is active. In order to demonstrate the wider range of writers whose philosophical sympathies are process-oriented, I refer to John Magee for these next points.[6]

From a process view, reality--the universe--is understood to be organismic, that is, inherently related within itself. First, the world is not a machine, as Western thought often characterizes it in our scientific age. The world is, rather, alive with 'becoming-events' which are in necessary relationship to each other. Second, there is some degree of subjectivity in these 'becoming-events,' even in those of non-living matter. This point has been discussed in more detail in Chapter One: actual occasions are the 'experiencing events' which constitute reality. They have inward feelings and graspings among themselves. They are self-constituting events, not determined simply by

---

[6]John B. Magee, Reality and Prayer (New York: Harper & Row, 1957). I consider this book the best of this century's books on prayer. Magee is thoroughly modern yet thoroughly Christian, and his broad range of knowledge is easily demonstrated in this very thoughtful, but readable, book for laity. For my purposes here, Chapter 2, "Science, Law and Prayer" is the most important part of the book; I draw particularly from pages 12-22. It is also significant to note that, among other famous scientists from earlier in this century, Magee quotes and refers to Whitehead a number of times.

the events of the past. Thus, a third point about reality is that freedom is real. Chemistry and physics, for example, function under laws which are not absolute, but rather statistical; as Magee says, these laws "are the averages of the actions of the organic units which constitute the world of living nature."[7]

In understanding our own bodies as part of nature, we see a kind of analogic relationship. Each cell lives its own life, yet within an organ, and the organ within the unified scheme of the body. This is particularly true about that part of human selfhood which is often termed 'the soul.' The potential which will and consciousness have, beyond that of a mechanistic view, has been convincingly demonstrated in our times.

With these general ideas as a background, what then is a process view of God? Before beginning to answer, I should briefly stop and clarify my grounds for making these, and any other, metaphysical assertions. The appeal in matters of this kind is ultimately to our own experience of life. In speaking to this point, John Yungblut says:

> Man's notion of the being and attributes of God is ultimately dependent solely upon his experience of a presence in himself, not altogether himself, and of a presence in other men, not to be wholly identified with themselves.[8]

Whitehead made the same point in general terms, which is known in the pithy statement, "The sole appeal is to intuition."[9] This epistemological basis is not the same as a merely inward 'navel-gazing,'

---

[7]Ibid., pp. 16-17.   [8]Yungblut, p. 14.

[9]Alfred North Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York: Macmillan, 1929), p. 32.

however; it depends especially upon the organic and unconscious relationships by which reality necessarily functions.

Perhaps the first point about a process view of God, which is especially relevant to prayer, is that God is not conceived of as 'absolutely' absolute. This is a philosophical possibility which many modern thinkers have not seriously considered or are unwilling to accept. It is possible, in Norman Pittenger's words, for God to be "absolute in some respects and contingent or relative in others."[10] Furthermore, Pittenger insists that this view of God is what Jesus, the Bible, and believers today experience and proclaim. God is absolutely loving--faithful in desiring relationship with all creatures and the best for them; wise in offering the best possibilities; never giving up. God is limited, because all creatures of the world have final determination of their becomingness, and because God is always related to and influenced by each moment of all the becomings of the world. This view of God as "limited" is not as terrifying to me as is the common mechanistic one, with God as the enigmatic controller of all, or as One who makes decisions with push-button like capriciousness.

In speaking of the absolute love of God as a basic quality of God's nature, I have introduced a second vital aspect, that of personalness. God has personal qualities, although it would be absurd to suppose that they include a physical body in the limited sense that we humans have bodies. Pittenger helps us again, by idenfitying some of the

_____

[10]Pittenger, p. 35. The following ideas in this paragraph are also found here.

personal qualities of God which help us understand the One to whom we pray.[11]

First, though, we shall digress again for a moment. At this point we are moving from the realm of sensitive but uncommitted metaphysics to faithful but speculative theology. The relationship between metaphysics and theology has been long and arduously debated, and the debating continues. My point is simply (if simplicity is possible here) that the two topics are not the same, that each has its own ground and rules. Overlap will be, and is here, inevitable and evident. The theological task is to make use of metaphysical categories without violating them. Whitehead himself wrote some very profound and beautiful theological statements in Process and Reality, but they were in the context of developing a cosmological scheme. My attempt is to make clear the metaphysical basis for the theological claims which I set forth.

It is clear to me, then, that it is within the realm of Whitehead's philosophy to speak of personal qualities of God. God is aware of both self and other actual entities. God has purpose, both for self and for other entities. God has intimate communication with others, which is reciprocally received. God enjoys authentic freedom within limits, as do other actual occasions. God has the capability, as we do, of loving and of being loved. God has all these qualities, as do we human creatures, although the degree to which God actualizes them is much greater. This is especially true when speaking of integration;

_____

[11]These ideas are found in ibid., ch. 2, esp. pp. 27-34.

God is the supreme exemplar of integration, even though integration involves necessary and intimate relations with all creatures.

John Yungblut succinctly summarizes, in his own words, this process view of God which informs contemporary prayer. He says:

> The only God whom modern man can worship and address in prayer is the personalized source of, and energy for, a continuing creation, a within-ness "deep down things," which has already unfurled and opened up and evolved into human personality with its potential for goodness, compassion, and love.[12]

This understanding of God is in response to more adequate, complex knowledge about the universe. Just as importantly, however, it brings us closer to what is behind the message of the Bible and of Christian faith. It is not possible, in this context, to argue for this claim. However, one illustration should help demonstrate the point.

The Good Samaritan parable in Luke 10 is part of a larger pericope which precedes the parable proper (v. 25 versus v. 30). In the pericope, a Jewish lawyer asks Jesus about the requirements for eternal life. Jesus replies by asking him what the Jewish law says (a reference to the Torah). The lawyer repeats the famous Shema from Deuteronomy 6, and the "love your neighbor" section from Leviticus. When Jesus expresses his approval, the man inquires further, asking, "And who is my neighbor?" It was an appropriate question for a legalist, since the passage in Leviticus (19:17-18) refers fairly clearly to another Jew as neighbor. Jesus replies by telling the parable of the Good Samaritan.

The story is full of racial, political and religious factors

---

[12]Yungblut, p. 44.

and innuendoes which do not relate directly to the point at issue here. It is easily seen that the Samaritan, a member of a religious group hated by most Jews--thus the least likely one to be a hero in a Jewish story--, is the real neighbor, because he acted mercifully. One of the points that Jesus makes here is that one's spirituality ("You shall love the LORD your God. . .) is not separable from one's action in life ("You shall love your neighbor as yourself"). This pericope dramatizes the challenge which authentic faith brings to personal piety.

III. A PROCESS CONCEPTION OF PRAYER

Now we are ready to look at these notions about the world and God as they can inform a contemporary understanding of prayer. What is apparent, first of all, is that prayer is a relationship between us and God. It is one of active mutuality: both God and we aim to both give and receive in prayer. However, as the fully responsive and receptive One, God is, in a sense, fully involved in prayer. In contrast, our finitude limits our potential and ability to be prayerful in such breadth and depth.[13] Nonetheless, this given mutuality in prayer is the cornerstone for what prayer is about; as Pittenger says, "the basic point of prayer is a union of these two basic desires: a man's desire to be fulfilled in God and God's desire to be fulfilled in man."[14] With more emphasis upon the human aspect of prayer, John Cobb has written that

Prayer can be understood broadly to include the whole stance of openness to God and responsiveness to the divine call. This is

---

[13]Pittenger, p. 146.   Ibid., p. 149.

of primary importance . . . . prayer has its place as a specific practice of intensification of the Christian stance toward God.[15]

This is one way of saying that prayer is both an attitude and an activity. It also points to prayer's particularity, as "a specific practice of intensification."

A second characteristic of prayer is the integral part that one's belief about prayer has on the practice. Cobb is again helpful; he has written:

> The essence of prayer is attention to something one believes to be real and supremely important, and the exercise of the appropriate response. When such belief is lacking, there can be meditation and consciousness-changing techniques, but no prayer. When there is a convincing image of God, there will be prayer in this specific sense. The content and character of prayer vary according to the image.[16]

The value of belief has been discussed in Chapter One. We are reminded again here that beliefs shape how we understand our activities, and this is so very true in prayer. A mechanistic view of reality makes prayer nonsensical, in conflict with any intuitive sense of a personal Other in our presence. In contrast, a process view of reality opens the way to understanding God and the world in ways which encourage one's fulfillment of deeply-felt needs and desires. The importance of the relationship between one's image of God and one's praying should not be underestimated.

If, as I have just claimed, mutuality is a necessary basis for

---

[15]"Spiritual Discernment in a Whiteheadian Perspective," in Harry James Cargas and Bernard Lee (eds.), Religious Experience and Process Theology (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), p. 363.

[16]Ibid., p. 364.

prayer, then it is consistent to expect that change can occur in and through that relationship. God can change through our praying, as we are more open and responsive to God's call (the initial aim). Our co-operation aids God's work in the world which, as discussed in Chapter One, is constantly adjusting itself to the responsiveness of each creature of the world. Pittenger writes: "God is 'changed' precisely in that through his relationship with the world he is given further opportunities to create greater good and to implement such good as is already there."[17] A common kind of change in prayer, which Christians expect, is a change in the world, whether it be for ourselves (petition) or more societal (intercession). Process thought makes this sort of request metaphysically tenable. We can expect, for ourselves as an examples, that attention to improving responsiveness to God will mean greater, more particular attention by God to that which needs our improved responsiveness. Hence, one result of prayer, Pittenger reminds us, is a change in our desires and subsequently of that which we request.[18] God is aiming for our best; we then can be motivated to pray, in order to aim with God for this potential which is offered to us.[19]

These ideas about prayer are general in nature and have many implications. One is that prayer, rather than being antithetical to conscious thought processes, is actually complementary to them.[20] Complementarity applies also to the relationship between religious tradition and spontaneous creativity. Mario Puglisi wrote: "it is useless to try

---

[17]Pittenger, p. 153.   [18]Ibid., p. 159.

[19]See Yungblut, pp. 46-48.   [20]See Heard, p. x.

to suppress either of these two tendencies; for both are the very essence of life, the real cause which has made man what he is."[21] Thinking/praying and tradition/creativity both have their metaphysical basis in the mental and physical poles of the actual occasion (see Chapter One).

Secondly, because of the vast unconsciousness of the human soul, we need to learn to use our intuition to understand prayer. Puglisi, not known to be a process thinker, was aware of this when he wrote:

> . . . all empirical consciousness receives fragmentary impressions and . . . it is only through the intuitive power of the spirit that we are able to perceive that unity which eludes the world of sense.[22]

Puglisi here calls attention to unity as that which intuition helps us know and understand. Thirdly, when thinking about different types of prayer, we must avoid the urge to keep absolute divisions between them. Prayer is possible because God loves us and initiates relationship with us; this requires spontaneity and openness, not rigid rules.[23]

A fourth implication about prayer, derived from the notions which we have discussed, concerns what Whitehead called "importance."[24] If we reflect upon our own lives, we can see that most of what goes on is fairly humdrum and of no singular significance. However, there do occur certain 'exceptional moments' in one's life which have an uncommon

---

[21]Mario Puglisi, _Prayer_ (New York: Macmillan, 1929), p. 46.

[22]Ibid., p. 40. See again Whitehead, p. 32.

[23]See Pittenger, pp. 162-63.

[24]See Alfred North Whitehead, _Modes of Thought_ (New York: Free Press, 1938), chapter 2, for a discussion of this term and concept.

effect upon one's future. These may be choice of a job, career, or marriage partner, a death or tragedy, or, more dramatically perhaps, religious conversion or 'chance' happenings leading to major events. They are important because they affect us inwardly and make possible new options for us, as they can for sub-human creatures as well.[25] For several reasons, it would be especially helpful to pray in some way during these moments. We can also expect that, in prayer itself, some of these special moments will occur. This suggests, fifthly, that one purpose of disciplined prayer is not to fulfill a law but to be familiar and receptive enough to experience a special moment with God. Thus, prayer is neither dependent upon nor devoid of matter-of-factness, good or uncomfortable feeling.

One final point about prayer should be noted before presenting a working definition of prayer. It has been implied in the discussion that prayer is periodic. That is, it does not engage one's attention all waking hours; a person takes time to pray as s/he takes time to eat, to have a conversation, read, work or do other activities. This does not mean, of course, that prayer happens only at set times, under set circumstances, or with one's fully conscious faculties. Instead, a process view sees the development of one's relationship with God involving more of a continuum of experiences, ranging from dreaming to corporate, spoken prayer. While not all experiences can be classified prayer, the distinctions are sometimes subtle.

Therefore we can understand prayer as being possible in

---

[25]See Pittenger, pp. 73-75, for more discussion of this subject.

traditional forms and also, in a less focused way, during other activities such as exercise, work, conversation and so on. Such less focused times need complementation by focused times, in order to gain their efficacious potential. Similarly, consciously-focused prayer needs complementation from the 'brooding of the depths' which less-focused prayer provides. Not all thought is prayer and not all prayer is thought.

In summarizing these thoughts, we can draw again upon a not-explicitly-process writer to state the case. Gerald Heard speaks about the purpose of life:

> Life, then, exists in order that consciousness may evolve, and each individual is equipped with a body, which is devised to give him, in a series of developing experiences from birth to death, the possibility of making those creative responses which will finally, in High Prayer--which permits a constant awareness of union with the entire Consciousness--bring him into that complete understanding.[26]

Heard's somewhat Platonic view of consciousness and body is not a process emphasis, but other points are consonant: life as process, potential for creativity and freedom to exercise it, and awareness of relationship with God. Drawing from this discussion, then, prayer is seen to be the periodic process of directly attending to the ongoing, developing relationship between oneself, us and God by aiming for greater sensitivity and responsiveness to God's aims. It is a practice fully conformable, and even desirable, to a process perspective of reality and of faith. Indeed, prayer makes more sense for me in this modern perspective than in the Hellenistic one which has dominated Christian theology. This process-based definition also seems to have closer

---

[26]Heard, p. 121.

affinities with what we know about Jesus and his faith, and about the faith of the Bible.

IV. INTEGRATIVE PRAYER

The case for which I argue goes one step beyond developing a process definition of prayer. In Chapter One I explained how Whitehead's philosophy is a philosophy of integration, and how integration is one particular way of understanding the philosophy of organism in general. I now submit that, given the discussion of both chapters to this point, it is defensible to speak of prayer as one, perhaps the most important, means of integration. Prayer can function to bring together, harmoniously yet creatively, all the aspects of one's selfhood, including one's body and one's action in the world. Let us highlight the points for this claim.

God is the ordering principle of reality, responding fully to each moment of the world and offering in the new moment, to each new actual occasion, the ideal possibility for it, given its own standing and perspective in the world. Actual occasions have the freedom to respond to that aim from God; what they become is finally self-determinative, within the limits set by their particular pasts. Becoming, therefore, is an integrative process, regardless of how well or poorly the integration happens. For human beings, integration is extremely complex. The many societies constituting the body and the predominantly unconscious nature of the dominant occasion, the soul, are the two principal ways to delineate this complexity. However, integration of some degree does occur each moment within the person.

Reality is processive, not static. Therefore, a more conscious-
ly purposeful integration is not a once-for-all goal to attain; it must
be constantly achieved, as new moments of the world become ingredient
for our constituting. Possibilities for novel, creative becoming are
offered each moment since God aims for both harmonizing and intensify-
ing our dealings with the world. God is the giver of these new possi-
bilities, and to become more sensitive and responsive to them demands
more than just thought. Feelings and attention to them are also indis-
pensable. Attention to all these aspects of life is necessary in order
to understand and do, each moment, what God wills. This is that upon
which a person focuses when praying.

Witnesses outside the identified 'process camp' have claimed
this integrative nature of prayer for several decades. Yungblut says
that in nurturing the discipline of prayer "we find we move in the di-
rection of greater wholeness and integration and are capable of more
consistent, compassionate and effective living."[27] William Adams Brown
emphasizes the need for God in integration:

> Prayer brings us into contact with God, and God is the only object
> in the world big enough and lasting enough and worthy enough to
> serve as the integrating principle of every human personality.[28]

Gerald Heard says that the unity of all life is the "basic discovery
and finding of prayer."[29] For him, this means that social action is

---

[27]Yungblut, p. 17.

[28]William Adams Brown, The Life of Prayer in a World of Science
(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), p. 45.

[29]Heard, pp. 39-40.

integrally related to praying: "prayer actively pursued and highly developed is a supreme social service if our society is to continue its progress as a society which thinks."[30] Not only does prayer include the social dimension, however; I firmly believe that it also expands into the subhuman world's needs. We are organic with nature. In this era of great environmental threat, it is imperative to recognize the value of and need to pray, with specific references, for the good of the subhuman world. (For a book on theology and ecology, written for wide audiences, see John Cobb's Is It Too Late?[31])

V. SUMMARY

In drawing the chapter to a close, we look again at another writer's definition of prayer. Heard explains prayer briefly in this way: "Prayer may then be defined as a method of empirical discovery, a technique for contacting and learning to know Reality. Further it need be neither capricious nor hidebound by tradition."[32] In prayer we develop our relationship with the One upon whom all the universe relies. That relationship is both spontaneous and predictable, because it is based upon the limitless love of God. Our faith allows us to experiment in prayer, to move beyond that which is customary into untapped possibilities. This is especially important for our integrative processes,

---

[30]Ibid., p. xii.

[31]John Cobb, Jr., Is It Too Late? (Beverly Hills: Bruce, 1972), esp. Part II, "The New Vision We Need." Cf. Yungblut, pp. 50ff.

[32]Heard, p. 51.

since life is always offering novelty to which we must, in one way or another, relate. We are not, however, mere responders; we are seekers, desiring a rich, abundant life. Praying helps us actualize these urges. Yungblut states this kerygmatically:

> Prayer is man's instinctive response to the immediate experience of the Other within. It is a phenomenon arising from his compelling need to relate to this Being who seeks him out, makes ultimate demands, but also forgives, accepts, and offers help.[33]

I believe that the process-oriented understanding of prayer and integrative prayer which is developed in this Chapter is fully Christian. It is consistent with both the judgment of sin and the proclamation of grace. By choice of emphasis, I have been more explicit about the possibilities of grace; I think though, that the relationship to sin has been alluded to and is not inherently denied. It is my hope that this kind of understanding of prayer will begin to shape the thought and action of Christians.

_____

[33]Yungblut, p. 26.

CHAPTER 3

TONGUE-SPEAKING AS PRAYER

I. INTRODUCTION

Prayer is like other human activities, in being experience which
is particular for the person who prays. Specific people who live at
specific times in specific places pray in specific ways about specific
things. In this Chapter, the endeavor is to demonstrate how the general
understanding of prayer in Chapter Two interprets a particular form of
prayer. The subject is tongue-speaking, a phenomenon which has been
widespread among many Christian groups in the past decade and has been
the focus of many and varied investigations and discussion. Christians
who "speak in tongues" firmly believe that it is a form of prayer. Our
study will begin by summarizing the views of both those who speak in
tongues and those who have studied it from social science perspectives.
Although not exhaustive or necessarily representative, I believe that
the following conclusions from linguistics, functional anthropology and
psychology are useful aids to formulating a process view of prayer. Af-
ter commenting on these theological and social scientific views, the
second task will be to present my argument for tongue-speaking as
prayer. This argument is based upon the aforementioned summaries and
utilizes the concepts of Chapter Two. Finally, I will attempt to ex-
plain the possibility of tongue-speaking as integrative prayer, build-
ing upon the prior sections of this Chapter. The last two sections
enter into the highest degree of speculation which this project under-
takes. Hopefully, though, it will be evident how the development of

relationships has been made and what those relationships are.

Before beginning, it will be helpful to note two points about the scope of the subject and of its literature. Tongue-speaking today is found in Pentecostal churches and charismatic groups. I am limiting this examination to charismatics. "Charismatic," as a theological term, refers here to Christians whose theological doctrines are most akin to, and greatly shaped by, those of many Pentecostal churches, but who are usually still members of churches whose histories go beyond this century. Charismatics are Baptist, Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and so on. With this limitation of scope, we avoid theological and historical complexities and subtleties which meet the student of Pentecostalism (which itself began around 1900). We also will stay within the movement with which I have had personal involvement and about which I can speak without constant bibliographical reference. Hence, the literature in the bibliography is more concerned with the charismatic movement, although the overlap with Pentecostalism is obvious.

Social science studies have not attempted theological assessments of tongue-speaking, but non-charismatic Christians have. Traditionally, the 'mainline' view has been to deny that tongue-speaking is a religious gift as Pentecostals have asserted. The mainline view explains the phenomenon psychologically.[1] While these explanations were

---

[1] See George Barton Cutten, Speaking with Tongues: Historically and Psychologically Considered (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927). Cutten's conclusions were very influential up until the last decade, when further studies challenged his theories.

intended to discredit tongue-speaking, some have been perceptive and illuminating. It will be seen that some recent psychological explanations give a favorable picture, even though they tend to deny religious efficacy.

II. SUMMARIES OF VIEWS ON TONGUE-SPEAKING

A. Charismatic

Charismatics base their understanding of tongue-speaking largely upon Acts and I Corinthians 12 and 14. On the day of Pentecost, the account in Acts 2 says that the Holy Spirit descended upon the gathered believers, and they spoke languages which were heard by Jews from other nations as their own languages (2:2-12). Other references in Acts associate a "baptism of the Holy Spirit" with tongue-speaking. In I Corinthians, Paul explains the relationships of various "gifts of the Spirit," which include tongue-speaking.

From these New Testament passages, charismatic theology interprets the activity of the Holy Spirit as comprising, in part, certain definite experiences for the believer. Of these, the first is salvation, which follows repentance and confession of faith in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord. The second experience is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, by which the believer is filled with the power to live the life of faith. For many charismatics, this baptism is accompanied by the gift of tongue-speaking, a sign of the Holy Spirit's baptism. Views differ as to how much time does (or should) occur between these two experiences. Of greater significance for our purposes is what charismatics

believe to be the nature and purpose of tongue-speaking. It is a language, given by the Spirit. It is not thought to be important whether it is a human one--current or dead--or an angelic one. The emphatic insistence is usually, however, that it is language.

Larry Christenson, a Lutheran charismatic pastor, has written on this subject[2] in a thoughtful and readable way. He says that the basic question here is, "Does speaking in tongues express meaning for the speaker, and does God understand it?"[3] In attempting to explain how tongue-speaking functions, Christenson employs the phrase "super-rational utterance":

> . . . utterance which would express shades of feeling and thought beyond the capability of ordinary speech. Yet to God, who can discern our innermost thoughts, these utterances would be perfectly understandable.[4]

This view is embraced by most, if not all, Pentecostals as well. Don Basham says that the believer speaks in tongues "because it grants the Christian a freedom in prayer which enables him to praise God extravagantly, beyond the limiting confines of known speech."[5] Hence, Basham sees a correlation between tongue-speaking and the degree of God's influence: "The tongue is the primary instrument of expression of the

---

[2]See esp. Larry Christenson, Speaking in Tongues: and its Significance for the Church (Minneapolis: Dimension, 1968).

[3]Ibid., pp. 26-27. Christenson refers to similar quotes by Agnes Sanford and Paul Tournier in this passage. Whether people understand the speaking is "irrelevant," he adds.

[4]Christenson, p. 27.

[5]Don Basham, "The Value of Speaking in Tongues," in Erling Jorstad (ed.), The Holy Spirit in Today's Church (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973), p. 83.

human personality, and until God has control over the tongue, His control over us is relatively slight."[6]

Charismatics, then, see tongue-speaking as language and certainly as prayer. What is different about this kind of praying is that the person's mind is not active in the speaking itself. The mind is "unfruitful," as Paul says (I Cor. 14:14). Fruitfulness--the personal strengthening of one's faith--comes as a result of the experience. Thus the purpose of tongue-speaking, in the vast majority of its occurrences, is for "private speaking to God and praising God."[7] Charismatic corporate worship, not examined in this project, can and often does include tongue-speaking; nevertheless, the primary place of tongue-speaking is in private.

In summary, then, charismatics relate the purpose of tongue-speaking to the wider arena of Christian 'life in the Holy Spirit.' Tongue-speaking is one manifestation of this fulness of life. Paul counted it as one of the less important gifts of the Spirit (I Cor. 12:27). A Catholic Pentecostal (i.e., charismatic) writing team, Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, explains the purpose of Holy Spirit baptism as, not "to spread the gift of tongues, but rather to deepen the Christian's relationship of love with God and man, in and through Christ."[8] The desire that springs from this experience, they say, is to witness to

---

[6]Ibid.

[7]Dennis Bennett, "The Gifts of the Holy Spirit," in Michael P. Hamilton (ed.), The Charismatic Movement (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), p. 18.

[8]Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, Catholic Pentecostalism (New York: Paulist Press, 1969), p. 197.

Christ.

Such an explanation of the origin, nature and purpose of tongue-speaking would be accepted by most charismatics. However, one Catholic Pentecostal has called for more dialogue between the experience and theological interpretation of it. Donald Gelpi, S.J., in urging more theological understanding of the charismatic phenomenon in general, says that theological reflection must "test the adequacy of its own hypotheses and conclusions" by checking itself out in light of "the charismatic experience in its historical development and human variety."[9] Gelpi is open to new ways of thinking this through: ". . . anyone attempting to reflect on the Pentecostal experience should be ready to draw upon whatever speculative resources may be available in our present state of theological consciousness."[10] Gelpi's openness allows for the possibility of applying process thought to an interpretation of tongue-speaking. My thesis is that process theology can be constructive about tongue-speaking's value while also being responsive to a wider range of evidence and evaluation of it as a phenomenon.

B. Social sciences

It is interesting to observe that many of the recent discussions of tongue-speaking are less pejorative than earlier ones. Many of these recent works are based upon research in the social sciences. In

---

[9]Donald Gelpi, Pentecostalism (New York: Paulist Press, 1971), p. 120.

[10]Ibid., p. 126.

Virginia Hine's research from a functional, anthropological perspective, she concluded that "we have come to assess glossolalia as a nonpathological linguistic behavior which functions in the context of the Pentecostal movement as one component in the generation of commitment."[11] In agreement with two previous studies to which she refers, Hine says that "Pentecostals as a group appear to be normally adjusted and productive members of society." In families where both spouses speak in tongues, Hine concludes that "family life tends to be more than normally integrated."[12] Several other studies reach very similar conclusions,[13] and it can be assumed that these conclusions apply equally to charismatics.

Linguists have also studied tongue-speaking. Their work has been to determine the nature of the utterance as a phenomenon--it is, or is it not, language? While it must be recognized that agreement upon a universal, descriptive definition is difficult, there are, nonetheless, very useful guidelines with which many linguists operate. One method commonly used is that of Charles F. Hockett, who believes that there are sixteen "design features" of every language for which dependable data exist. Although some of these features have appeared in samples of tongue-speaking, many are absent. The conclusion from this

---

[11]Virginia Hine, "Pentecostal Glossolalia: Toward a Functional Interpretation," in Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi (ed.), Research in Religious Behavior (Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1973), p. 303.

[12]Ibid., p. 286.

[13]For a detailed summary of some of these studies, older and more recent, see United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. General Assembly. Report of the Special Committee on The Work of the Holy Spirit (Philadelphia: 1970), Appendix B. It is a very good eight-page summary, citing researchers and their basic conclusions.

approach is that, based upon evidence from many samples, tongue-speaking is not a natural language, i.e., known to be spoken anywhere in the world. Whether or not one ever speaks an angelic language is an issue open only to speculation, not observation.[14]

William Samarin concurs with this conclusion. His definition of language, in simple terms, includes the features of internal, patterned order, arbitrary association with the objective world, and transmission by learning.[15] Although tongue-speaking has the second of these features, it has neither of the other two. Based upon a lengthy study, Samarin concludes that tongue-speaking is literally 'non-sensical.' He describes tongue-speaking as

> strings of syllables, made up of sounds taken from among all those that the speaker knows, put together more or less haphazardly but which nevertheless emerge as word-like and sentence-like units because of realistic, language-like rhythm and melody.[16]

Yet this does not imply, for Samarin, that tongue-speaking is "an isolated phenomenon."[17] Rather, Samarin says, "glossolalia is a much more normal phenomenon than people take it to be."[18] He believes that nothing 'takes over' the person who speaks: "all of us are equipped with everything we need to produce glossolalia."[19] This rejection of ecstasy as a required concomitant agrees with the charismatic view—emotion

---

[14]Reference for this paragraph is John Kildahl, "Psychological Observations," in Hamilton, p. 138.

[15]William Samarin, Tongues of Men and of Angels (New York: Macmillan, 1972), p. 120.

[16]Ibid., p. 227.   [17]Ibid., p. xiv.

[18]Ibid., p. 17.   [19]Ibid., p. 211.

is not necessary for tongue-speaking to be spiritually-based.[20]

Samarin's conclusions about the origin and nature of tongue-speaking are based only upon his training in linguistics. He does not conclude that there can be no religious value related to the experience. He writes that, even though "glossolalia is made up of common human stuff," so is all religion.[21] He terms tongue-speaking "a linguistic symbol of the sacred."[22] As a symbol, it is "an important component of personal, affective religion . . . the mystery of religion is symbolized, represented, and induced by glossolalia."[23] In concluding his book, he recognizes the difference in importance between his study and a theological one: "What I hear is nonsense; the sounds make no sense to me. But I know that what lies beyond is what counts, and that is sacred ground. . . . That too is 'nonsense.'"[24]

To summarize, then, anthropological study discounts the notion that tongue-speaking is pathological behavior, and linguistic study concludes that it is not language. The next appropriate question is, how does the speaking happen? This question has been considered by two psychologists (among others), both of whom happen also to be seminary professors. One of these is John Kildahl, whose thoughts on the subject are summarized well in his article, "Psychological Observations."[25] Kildahl takes a notably cautious stance in the evaluation of his research, but he is open to the possibility of the religious efficacy of

---

[20]See Bennett, p. 18.   [21]Samarin, ibid., p. 229.

[22]Ibid., p. 231.   [23]Ibid., p. 232.

[24]Ibid., p. 234.   [25]In Hamilton, pp. 124-142.

tongue-speaking. The use to which tongue-speaking is put makes the difference; Kildahl says:

> Micah said that true religion was to do justice, love kindness, and to walk humbly with God. If the practice of glossolalia produces these fruits, then it appears to me to be a responsible use of the experience.[26]

Two of Kildahl's observations are helpful here. First, he sees a relationship between belief, expectation and results (especially of feelings) in the tongue-speaker. Belief leads to the expectation that the result of tongue-speaking will be a very good feeling. That is, the feeling depends upon the belief, the expectation brings the results.[27] Second, Kildahl compares tongue-speaking capability to that of hypnosis: "In subordinating one's own ego to that of the authority figure, the initiate is able to regress psychologically to a level of childlike openness, dependency, and suggestibility."[28] The important point from this quote is the need for the tongue-speaker to have simple openness to a source of influence. This idea will be utilized later on.

Kildahl's observations are based upon exhaustive first-hand experience and study of tongue-speaking and tongue-speakers. In contrast, Wayne Oates' discussion is speculative, based more on psychological theory than first-hand observation. However, his contribution to the study of tongue-speaking provides interesting possibilities. Oates begins by suggesting that the background to the tongue-speaking phenomenon is cultural. Society in the United States is dominated by a mood of deep reserve concerning the discussion of personal religious

---

[26]Ibid., p. 142.   [27]See ibid., pp. 132-34.

[28]Ibid., p. 131.

interests.[29] Manifested especially among professional people, and even
in churches and seminaries, Oates sees this as an unhealthy psychologi-
cal situation: "this 'unspeakableness' concerning God, Christ, the
Holy Spirit, religious decision and personal commitment has all the ear-
marks of repression."[30] This condition is intensified by the fact that
our society is very observer-oriented, rather than participant-
oriented.[32]

Oates takes his most important clues for speculating about
tongue-speaking from the development of language in children. Accord-
ing to Piaget, ego-centric speech in the very young child can take
three forms. First, in repetition, words or syllables are spoken to no
one and are solely for pleasure. Second, in monologue, the speaker and
the listener are the same. Third, for the dual or collective monologue,
the other person is present, not to speak back, but to stimulate the
child's own speaking. As children grow older, they become more con-
cerned to have an effect upon others; this is when socialized speech
comes to be used. Tongue-speaking is this kind of phenomenon, says
Oates--one in which both self-centeredness and socialization are de-
sired by the speaker.[32] Oates sees a correlate to this interpretation
in Harry Stack Sullivan's three phases of early human development, es-
pecially the personal, unintelligible speech of the parataxic phase.[33]

---

[29]See Wayne Oates, "A Socio-Psychological Study of Glossolalia,"
in Frank Stagg, E. Glenn Hinson and Wayne Oates, Glossolalia (Nash-
ville: Abingdon Press, 1967), pp. 78-83.

[30]Ibid., pp. 82-83.   [31]Ibid., pp. 84-85.

[32]Ibid., pp. 85-89.   [33]Ibid., pp. 90-91.

C. Review and comment: theology and science

A central concept from process thought underlies the application of the above material to interpreting tongue-speaking. It derives from the doctrine that the final real things of all reality are actual occasions (see Chapter One). Despite great qualitative differences, all reality is the process of the becoming and perishing of actual occasion. Because of this 'ontological monism,' the nature of knowledge is organic. This means that, for example, the types of knowledge in the scientific and theological arenas are not antithetical to each other; rather, they are both parts of the larger, all-inclusive reality. In this project I utilize information from sciences, process philosophy and process theology. Process philosophy works in response to modern scientific findings and offers systematic speculation about the nature of the universe. In turn, then process theology utilizes the categories from process philosophy in developing (often novel) theological concepts. Each discipline has its own range of study, but the distinctions among them are not absolute.

For this reason, it is possible to make use of social science research in developing a theological understanding of tongue-speaking. It will not be necessary to dismiss charismatic claims for the religious efficacy of tongue-speaking; instead, a constructive interpretation is possible. How that can take shape will be appreciated if considered in the light of my own comments made about each of the preceding summaries of tongue-speaking.

We look first at the charismatic position. Its theological

interpretation will later be further discussed; here we are concerned with the claim as to the nature of the tongues that are spoken. As has already been noted, this claim appears to be very untenable. It is not my intention to argue this point, but only to suggest the problems involved with such an assertion. The evidence examined by linguistic experts runs counter to the claim. The evidence proposed by charismatics is usually third-hand and inconclusive, despite claims to the contrary.[34] Complicating the matter is the fact that the New Testament references themselves suggest at least two interpretations of tongue-speaking.[35]

My second comment about the charismatic view, from a process perspective, concerns its metaphysical basis. To speak of the origin of tongue-speaking as 'in the Holy Spirit,' simply given to the believer, does not account for the metaphysically-based complexities and subtleties both of God and of human selfhood (not to mention the rest of creation). Here, as throughout all charismatic theology, the metaphysical basis of its classical Western theology is clearly revealed. The implicit concept of God's absolute omnipotence does make sense of the claim that the Holy Spirit can miraculously give, to the receptive believer, a full language which the believer has never heard or learned.

---

[34]For contrasting view, see the articles, already cited, by Kildahl, pp. 137-38, and Bennett, pp. 24-30, in Hamilton. Cf. Samarin, Ibid.

[35]This point is a subject worthy of its own study. For two brief discussions by New Testament scholars, see Krister Stendahl, "The New Testament Evidence," in Hamilton, esp. pp. 49-54; also, see Frank W. Beare, "Speaking with Tongues: A Critical Survey of the New Testament Evidence," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII, 3 (September 1964), 229-246.

On the other hand, for process theology, the burden of explaining the origin of tongue-speaking is not simply a theological one. It requires also the critical assistance of those who have studied the nature of the phenomenon itself. Christians can, I believe, affirm and use tongue-speaking without feeling compelled to believe that it is language. In other words, even though one does not accept the charismatic view of tongue-speaking's nature, one can still support its purpose as prayer.

This assertion seems to me to be quite consonant with Larry Christenson's viewpoint. By emphasizing that the speaking expresses meaning for the speaker--meaning which God understands--Christenson, I believe, holds open the possibility of interpreting tongue-speaking in a 'noncharismatic' way. As a charismatic, he believes that it is language, but I shall argue that it is possible to reject this view and still preserve what Christenson says is the central aspect of tongue-speaking.

Now our attention moves to the social science treatment of tongue-speaking. By its nature, social science attempts no theological explanation for tongue-speaking. Its purpose is to describe the phenomenon as accurately as possible and then to offer interpretation from its own realm of knowledge. Samarin, the linguist quoted in the previous section, spends most of his book describing tongue-speaking as a phenomenon. However, he does recognize the importance of the religious dimension. He makes the (perhaps surprising) statement that religion is made of "common human stuff." Samarin would not try to support that opinion from linguistic study, but the point is akin to the process

view of reality. Compare to it Whitehead's position on the epistemo-

logical nature of religion; he wrote:

> Religious truth must be developed from knowledge acquired when our
> ordinary senses and intellectual operations are at their highest
> pitch of discipline. To move one step from this position towards
> the dark recesses of abnormal psychology is to surrender finally
> any hope of a solid foundation for religious doctrine.[36]

In this Chapter, I am attempting to develop a more precise understanding

of the religious truth concerning tongue-speaking. It is quite appro-

priate to utilize the fruit of others' "intellectual operations" in

thinking religiously and with discipline about tongue-speaking. It is

also proper to accept Samarin's view of tongue-speaking and then specu-

late as to how the sounds are made.

This is the kind of question which Kildahl's work begins to

answer. He has observed that the belief that one will have a good feel-

ing while tongue-speaking greatly aids the actual occurrence of the ex-

pected result. I suggest that this point could also be made about the

production of the utterance itself. In Chapter One we discussed the

importance of belief structures to how one interprets one's experience.

This point can be applied to the sounds themselves and is supported by

Samarin's linguistic point that anyone can do it. I hasten to add that

this is not a simplistic explanation which rejects religious efficacy

or spiritual origin. Such a charge might be appropriate if my reason-

ing was based on traditional metaphysics; this is not the case. The

vast and predominantly unconscious nature of the human person makes the

------

[36]Alfred North Whitehead, Religion in the Making (New York:
Meridian,1960), p. 120.

issue more involved. The traditional Western view that selfhood is mostly, or wholly, conscious does not account for the intricate relationships between God, belief, soul, body and action which I maintain are inherently necessary for adequate interpretations of our experiences in life, including those of tongue-speaking.

Kildahl's theory relating tongue-speaking to suggestibility also needs to be understood in light of this more complex view of reality. The point which Kildahl is making is that the tongue-speaker has to be willing to do something outside the realm of 'normal rationality'--speaking language-like sounds which no one can understand. This requires openness to a source of utterance which is not available in previously known means. Charismatics believe that the speech is miraculously given by the Holy Spirit; they put little stock in less theological explanation. In a process view, the divisions between types of knowledge are not absolute; religion is not a camp completely to itself. Thus, it is quite acceptable to consider a 'nontheological' source for tongue-speaking utterance, so far as that source contributes to our understanding. To repeat, this does not necessitate a dismissal of potential or actual religious origin or value.

As with Kildahl's notions, the charismatic reader may feel that Oates' suggested explanation of tongue-speaking is insulting or irrelevant (and probably irreverent as well!). Oates has even been criticized by other researchers for this interpretation.[37] Some of this criticism

---

[37]Felicitas Goodman criticizes Oates for talking about something that he has not even seen first-hand nor studies scientifically; see Felicitas Goodman, Speaking in Tongues (Chicago: University of Chicago

may be well-based, for as a Southern Baptist, Oates does not view tongue-speaking as a 'gift from God.' Even with this prejudice, though, I think that his ideas move our understanding along in insightful ways. Utilizing his work demonstrates, in support of process thought, that psychology and theology are not polar opposites. I repeat again that my use of these ideas is not to explain away the religious nature of tongue-speaking. It is to do justice, from a process perspective, to the theological claims of charismatics, in light of modern research on tongue-speaking.

Oates' work is relevant because he presents, without the theological dimension, a possible origin for the utterance as an observable phenomenon. If we accept Samarin's conclusions about the nature of tongue-speaking and of the ease by which anyone can produce it, Oates connects that ease to the (almost totally unconscious, I assume) memory of pleasant sounds and sound-making as a small child. This does not mean, of course, that a tongue-speaker is merely repeating nonsense sounds or speeches from early childhood; that is too simple an explanation. Kildahl agrees with a point in Chapter One concerning the critical importance of belief and expectation in this type of experience. The tongue-speaker is not wanting or trying to talk baby talk, s/he is aiming to speak to God with utterance which s/he knows does not come from cognitive learning. Words which the speaker understands will not

---

Press, 1972), pp. xix-xx. Interestingly enough, Samarin criticizes Goodman for having limited data as well (Samarin, p. 33). He also says that Oates' thesis is "very difficult to prove, of course" (Samarin, p. 38). I am attempting to utilize what I believe to be valuable points from both Samarin and Oates.

fulfill the requirement, so where does the person (not just the con-
scious mind) have in his/her experience any 'nonsensical speech' except
from his/her earliest days? As this speech is uttered, the person's
expectation is fulfilled and, as Kildahl says, good feelings often fol-
low.

III. TONGUE-SPEAKING AS PRAYER

A. Review of scientific, metaphysical and theological considerations

Several definite conclusions about tongue-speaking have emerged
so far in this chapter. Tongue-speaking is a behavior which does not
qualify as a social or psychiatric abnormality. It is not language, as
we know languages; it is a flow of internally unrelated syllables which
sound like sentences because of rhythm and melody. Certain psychologi-
cal factors figure prominently in the origin and production of the
sounds. Belief and expectation shape the speaker's experience--belief
that the sounds will be an 'unknown tongue,' and the expectation of per-
sonal edification because of the tongue-speaking. This requires open-
ness, on the part of the speaker, to something beyond his/her currently-
known language(s). Quite possibly, the source for tongue-speaking is
related to memories and experiences of early childhood nonsense speech,
an activity which felt like language, but was not, and which was usual-
ly pleasant and satisfying. That tongue-speaking has become so prom-
inent in the church today may be partly due to a cultural tendency to
avoid discussing ultimate personal matters, a proclivity which has been
pervasive even in churches.

These notions, and the discussion which has supported them, figure importantly as we now discuss tongue-speaking as prayer. By way of introduction, we will review the metaphysical considerations which shape a process view of prayer. Secondly, we will concisely state the main points concerning prayer from Chapter Two.

Process theology begins its work on the basis of metaphysical concepts from Whitehead's philosophy of organism. Reality is process, the never-ceasing becoming and perishing of actual occasions, the basic 'real things' of all reality. Actual occasions have internal relations with other actual occasions; this is the basis for the organismic nature of the universe. God is a crucial element of reality. God is both transcendent and immanent, intimately involved with all actual occasions, aiming for the best possibility for each momentary actual occasion. God has personal qualities--awareness, purpose, intimacy with others, freedom within limits, and love. Because of God the possibility for change is always available to the creatures of the universe; for humans, this is especially true. The past does not determine the future, even though it has an undeniable effect upon how each new occasion both feels the past which it grasps and aims for its (the occasion's) becoming. The movement of reality is for greater harmony and intensity in all actual occasions. This means that risk is necessary, for humans and all other creatures, even though risk does not guarantee perpetuation of the past.

With this basic background, we have understood prayer to be the periodic process of directly attending to the ongoing, developing relationship between God and oneself/us/world by aiming for greater

sensitivity and responsiveness to God's aims. Prayer's functions, forms and circumstances are varied, but they all share these common views: the necessity of a clear understanding of, belief in and trust in God; the givenness of mutuality between oneself/us/world and God; and the possibility of change occurring in me, us, and the world, because of God's aims for change and improvement. Implications of this view of prayer include prayer's complementarity to thought processes, prayer's utilization of both tradition and creativity, the need for exercising intuition, the divisions of types not absolute, and the value of "important" moments. How does this process view of prayer interpret tongue-speaking as prayer? The following pages are my attempt to answer this question.

B. A process interpretation

The overall point which has emerged for me is that a process view of prayer can support the charismatic claim to tongue-speaking as prayer. First, prayer assumes, for both the charismatic and the process view, the existence of God and belief/trust in God. These beliefs uniquely and formatively affect what and how one believes about prayer. The second point concerns the relationship of mutuality in prayer. As noted earlier, charismatics see tongue-speaking as a way "to deepen the Christian's relationship of love with God and man, in and through Christ." (see page 39) This statement affirms the potential efficacy which tongue-speaking has for functioning as a means of developing one's relationship with God. It, too, is consistent with a process view of prayer. Third--with respect to change which happens through,

and because of, prayer--charismatics firmly believe and witness to changes in people's lives which are integrally related to the use of tongue-speaking.

The implications of a process view of prayer can also relate to this chapter's interpretation of tongue-speaking. First, the complementary nature of prayer to thinking is especially relevant to tongue-speaking. Paul witnessed to this centuries ago: "I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the mind also." (I Cor. 14:15) The efficacy of this practice might be due in part to the nonsense nature of the utterances. The tongue-speaker's mind is not attempting to verbalize thoughts, that is, to be discrete and concrete. At the same time, however, the rhythm and meter of the tongue-speaking gives it a sense of clear expression. Therefore, it is possible that this overall experience could allow a greater openness to the relationships between aspects of a person and God's aims for that person. Much of one's past is unconscious and cannot be easily recalled or discovered by conscious efforts. Tongue-speaking may be able to allow these processes more freedom to gain new prominence (consciously and unconsciously) for the person and also, thus, to help God shape more particular aims for that person's greater good. In addition, tongue-speaking could then be complemented by, and complement, the person's conscious thinking about personal needs and intercessions of any kind. This could also involve a style including verbal prayer.

Secondly, we have seen that both tradition and creativity are necessary for prayer. This is true both for one's own personal past, and creative possibilities for it, and for Christian tradition in

general, with the host of novel opportunities which are before it as it meets the world every moment. Tongue-speaking can be a way of praying for guidance, of 'brooding with God' over something which needs a new synthesis of actuality. Insight derived from such prayer is dependent, thirdly, upon intuition. A person's conscious processes are but the tip of the iceberg which constitutes selfhood. In an important way, feelings are primary, and praying needs to pay attention to them. Tongue-speaking, as a practice which does not demand cognitive concentration, may help a person become more sensitive to God's aims, since those aims enter human experience at the unconscious level. This intuitive process is intricate and subtle; it should not be confused with the more popular, tradition-based (and problematic) notion that God's will may be clearly known through inner witness. In other words, God is not equal to the unconscious, although God is present in and one aspect of unconscious contents. This understanding of God confirms the need for discernment in understanding one's inwardness, through prayer or any other means.

The fourth implication of a process view of prayer is that divisions between types of prayer are not absolute. This can also work very well in tongue-speaking, for the speaker has no need to verbalize, during the speaking, the various images and feelings which come to consciousness. A tongue-speaker may wish to fix attention upon some issue for which the tongue-speaking may be offered as prayer. At other times, the speaker may choose praise, confession, or another type, or may simply let the mind be free to attend to whatever it does. All these possibilities are consonant both with the charismatic view and with the

process view of prayer.

Finally, tongue-speaking can help elicit "important" moments. It is the witness of many charismatics that valuable insights for their lives have sometimes come during tongue-speaking. A second possibility occurs in those times when the tongue-speaker is experiencing an important moment which was not elicited by religious activity. It seems entirely acceptable in that moment for the tongue-speaker to speak in tongues, as a way of 'praying in the depths' about the situation. Incidentally, tongue-speaking does not always have to be aloud. I think that it would be almost universally accepted by charismatics that one can 'speak' one's 'prayer language' silently, without audial verbalization. This could be beneficial for someone who wishes to pray silently about something but feels the constraint both of uncertainty about the need and of the presence of others.

C. Distinguishing marks of process prayer

The purpose of the above section has been to relate charismatics' understanding of tongue-speaking as prayer to this project's process view of prayer. The ideas which have been presented are ones which I believe are constructive and important contributions to a more adequate interpretation of tongue-speaking. Equally as important, in my opinion, are the points at which a process view of prayer will carry its interpretation beyond that of charismatics. I will mention three general notions; no doubt it is possible to discover others.

One, what is of particular value in the process view of prayer is that it presents explicitly and clearly its view of reality and of

God. Moreover, this view is based upon clear metaphysical principles, which are themselves in response to the most accurate understanding of the world which is available to human effort. The reader knows by now that I consider this 'beginning at the beginning' as an ultimately necessary task for people who take faith seriously. While I doubt that all Christians will ever delve this deeply, I still believe that some "vision of reality" guides, however consciously or unconsciously, each believer's theological ideas.[38]

A second notion which process thought carries beyond the charismatic view of prayer concerns mutuality of relationship. In my experience with and reading in the charismatic movement, I have met only one or two people for whom social, world and ecological issues were a deep concern. One of the reasons for this, I believe, is that charismatic theology tends to be individual-oriented. In contrast, process theology is easily applicable to an all-inclusive perspective on the world. It recognizes the essential relationships between all creatures, nonhuman as well as human. References to this have already been made,[39] and it will be discussed again in section IV of this chapter.

Thirdly, process prayer recognizes the need for change in wider arenas than what seems to be usually emphasized by charismatics. Persons can change not only in personal morality, but can also become more

---

[38]A non-technical, brief discussion of the term "vision of reality" and how it is useful to faith can be found in John B. Cobb, Jr., Liberal Christianity at the Crossroads (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973), pp. 94-95.

[39]As noted in Chapter Two, section IV, note 31, see Cobb, Is It Too Late? (Beverly Hills: Bruce, 1973).

aware of needs of the larger world (including trees, land, animals,
etc.) In prayer, a person can seek guidance for actions in these
larger arenas. Such wider concern for change can be included in tongue-
speaking; nothing about it contradicts this possibility. Process
prayer functions with the knowledge that God also changes, in how and
what way each particular aim for each occasion is shaped. God's aims
for me at this moment are different than they were a month ago, for ex-
ample, because of all the new occasions of me which have become and
gone in that time. What does not change in God, through, is the "pure
unbounded love" by which each aim is determined.

D. Distinctiveness of tongue-speaking

With these notions before us, constituting an argument for
tongue-speaking as prayer, we can now consider what is distinctive
about tongue-speaking. It has, first of all, a phenomenological dis-
tinctiveness among forms of prayer. Here are used spoken sounds which
do not communicate in any normal way to either speaker or listener.
That is, the activity itself <u>sounds</u> like it is some language--we would
assume a human one--but no example of tongue-speaking has ever been
conclusively demonstrated to <u>be</u> a natural human language. It is possi-
ble that further evidence will suggest the contrary, but that evidence
would have to be very substantial.

However, we must not forget that the religious importance of
tongue-speaking does not, in a process perspective, depend upon its
being language. William Samarin has affirmed this point for us, speak-
ing as a linguist. What has been done in this Chapter is to speculate,

with the aid of both social science and theology, on how tongue-speaking can function as prayer. More specifically, what makes tongue-speaking function as prayer, in a way which is different from any other form?

Let us consider the following speculations. Tongue-speaking may make it easier, than with other forms of prayer, to deal with the vague, unconscious contents of experience. As one becomes more conscious of these contents, one can then aim to become more sensitive and responsive to God's aims. These aims, each moment, will more particularly include the proposition to integrate the newly-conscious contents. Integration can and does, of course, occur on the unconscious level as well.

How is this possible? How could it happen? The crucial point is that the production of the language-like activity frees the mind from the need to work on articulate speech. This could then allow freedom for feelings and images--which are unarticulated--to gain more intensity, more prominence. God's aims would then reflect the speaker's desire for greater concord with the newly-intensified feelings. As the person consciously aims to be more sensitive and responsive to God, it may, and probably does, occur. One's responsiveness and range of sensitivity depend, of course, upon one's current belief structure, one's knowledge of self and the world, and one's perspective of self and the world. Remember that God is not the only formative element in one's unconscious. The decisive point is that tongue-speaking may allow for a more complete activity of one's soul, with the simultaneous sense of definite verbal expression of that activity.

If tongue-speaking has this potential for efficacious prayer,

as delineated above, does this imply that tongue-speaking is a necessary, or the best, form of prayer? No; rather, the implication throughout has been that tongue-speaking is one form of prayer and that it can function symbiotically with articulate forms of prayers. The nature of tongue-speaking gives it this possibility for complementing, and being complemented by, the prayer forms which are more precise, conscious, simple and dominant in Western religion. A comparative study, utilizing some criteria of evaluation, would be necessary in order to make a judgment about tongue-speaking relative to other forms. Even then, such a study would be hard pressed to account for all the variables of the experience of prayer, which has such an inward focus (not to be confused with interest only in oneself).

Therefore, I conclude that tongue-speaking is a valid form of prayer for Christians, if--and this can be said for other, less sensational forms of prayer--it is done with care, sincerity, awe and humility. No one can fool God, though it is very easy to fool oneself. No form of prayer is a wonder-working gimmick, because God is not a slot machine or cure-all elixir.

To summarize the basis for my claim that tongue-speaking is a form of prayer: the three factors of belief, desire/aim, and the specific activity make it so. One must believe in God and in the efficaciousness of tongue-speaking as prayer; one must have the desire to be engaged in a prayer relationship in this way; and one must 'do' the speaking. From Cobb and Kildahl we have recognized the great shaping influence which one's belief structures have; they significantly affect how one understands one's experience. From Samarin we see tongue-speaking

as something which is linguistically nonsensical and yet easy to do. From Oates we speculate that these sounds and rhythms have some basis in mostly unconscious, early childhood experiences. From process thought we see the unceasing function of aims, both of God and of all creatures. All three factors--belief, desire/aim and activity--are what makes tongue-speaking prayer. It must also be said again that, as with any form of prayer, this is no gimmick. Belief and desire cannot be faked, even if sounds can be easily produced.

Perhaps this three-point basis for tongue-speaking can be il-luminated by reference to a common problem of people who try to make prayer a vital factor in their lives. Charismatic teaching says that emotion is not a goal of speaking in tongues. This refers to the need to accept 'dry times,' i.e., when no feeling is present during prayer. What makes the difference, I am claiming, is how one understands the experience of prayer in the context of one's faith and theological per-spective. Dryness is handled by praying people with the unswerving conviction that one's relationship with God is developing and improv-ing--that one is, in the long run, becoming more sensitive and respon-sive to God--regardless of how one feels during the practice of prayer. Dryness is also met with the continued desire to keep praying, based upon one's belief as just explained.

IV. TONGUE-SPEAKING AS INTEGRATIVE PRAYER

Integrative prayer was described in Chapter Two as the periodic process of attending to the developing relationship between God and oneself, with regard for the need to be harmoniously and intensely

functioning in every aspect of one's selfhood-spirit, soul, body and action. Tongue-speaking can be this type of prayer. I believe that this is a possibility with great potential, even though it has not been identified in this way before. As integrative prayer, tongue-speaking would need two factors which all integrative prayer needs. The first is the awareness, and acceptance, of a process view of reality. This does not require reading technical literature in process philosophy and theology. It does, however, take the perspective of the processive and organismic nature of all life, and the understanding that some kind and degree of integration happens each moment with each creature of the world (see Chapter One to review details). The second factor for integrative prayer is the desire/aim of the person to (1) become more harmonious and intense in all aspects, by (2) becoming more sensitive and responsive to God's aims. Note that the three-point basis for tongue-speaking as prayer is applicable here. It is, in a sense, a 'formula' for describing what constitutes prayer.

Does tongue-speaking have distinctive possibilities as integrative prayer? Yes: it combines the distinctiveness of integrative prayer with the distinctiveness of tongue-speaking. Both the use of tongue-speaking and the perspective of integrative prayer are distinguishable within the genre of prayer. Combining the two should, therefore, present some novel possibilities. One type of possibility could be termed 'plumbing the depths.' In the desire to integrate the various aspects of selfhood, tongue-speaking might help the person bring up to consciousness a variety of experiences, needs, ideas, etc., any of which could assist the particular desired/necessary integration. This

would sometimes involve awareness of need, searching for creative solutions (from God) of many kinds, healing of body and/or soul, and trying to become more responsive to God in a particular way. The goal is to live 'unifyingly,' dealing with the many contrasts of life in a balanced way without sheltering oneself from challenging aspects or possibilities.

Delineation of further potential efficacy for integrative tongue-speaking awaits the practitioner. My goal in this Chapter has been to suggest how this can be possible in general terms from a process theological perspective.

CHAPTER 4

INTEGRATIVE PRAYER IN THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH

I. CONCLUSIONS THROUGH CHAPTER THREE

Before discussing some of the more practical aspects of this

project, it will be helpful to review and clarify the conclusions and

theses which I have drawn from my study. Chapter One lays the frame-

work for the subsequent chapters in developing, from a process perspec-

tive, a concept of integration. Integration has been defined as "the

ongoing actualization [not necessarily and/or always conscious] of

heightening one's experience of being unity within diversity, giving

necessary attention to the various aspects of selfhood." (page 15)

These various aspects were described generally in terms of "spirit,"

"soul," "body" and "action." Such a concept of integration is, I be-

lieve, implicit in Christian faith. Furthermore, it can be more ade-

quately understood if based upon a process understanding of reality.

This understanding involves relatedness, process and purpose as inher-

ent to the nature of reality. Thus, process integration involves re-

latedness, process and purpose. More particularly, the human person

consists of physiological, emotional, volitional, mental and spiritual

expressions--all of which are intrinsic and thus should not be ignored

in the integrative process. The complexity of the human person defies

a simple, easy view of integration, but integration is nonetheless pos-

sible and desirable. In more precise language, integration of some

kind and degree does occur in every person; what is desirable is to aim

for better integration by becoming more sensitive and responsive to God's aims for oneself. Such responsiveness depends to a large degree upon one's belief structures, especially those about God.

Chapter Two applies these general notions about integration to an understanding of prayer as integrative. How prayer is understood depends very much upon how one understands the nature of reality and especially of God. God is, in a process view, both limited and unlimited, fully loving, fully responsive to every actual occasion, aiming for the best that is possible for each occasion. God has self-awareness, purpose, intimate relationship with others, and genuine freedom. These ideas, taken together with those from Chapter One, suggest that prayer involves mutuality between God and us, belief and trust in God's presence and activity, and change which happens to and in us, the world and God. Thus, a working definition of prayer is "the periodic process of directly attending to the ongoing, developing relationship between oneself/us and God by aiming for greater sensitivity and responsiveness to God's aims." (page 30) Integrative prayer, then, is what all prayer should be: including all aspects of selfhood--spirit, soul, body and action--in one's 'pursuit' of God's aims. This set of notions about integrative prayer may then be applied to one's specific circumstances.

One of the most basic points which Chapter Two tries to establish is that prayer should, by its nature, take in every dimension of selfhood. However, observation of the history of Christian piety strongly suggests, if not concluding univocally, that prayer has been understood in a narrower sense. What has often been lacking is the

recognition and appreciation for the less- and non-conscious aspects of one's selfhood, including the bodily functions. Prayer also often neglects clarity concerning the inherent relationships between person, people, events and all creation. I have tried to make clear that this kind of narrowness has a metaphysical basis which Whitehead's philosophy tries to overcome. With this limited perspective as a theological and historical background, it is especially important for modern Christians to give explicit attention in their outlook and prayer to the subconscious, unconscious, bodily and active aspects of being human. This kind of attention does not imply that God is to be identified with these nonconscious aspects. It does, though, affirm God's involvement with them. Human development is thus also properly to regard them.

Chapter Three speaks to this need in illustrative manner, by trying to interpret tongue-speaking in the context of integrative prayer. I proposed in that chapter that tongue-speaking can complement the traditional verbal forms of prayer by helping to deal more readily with the unconscious aspects of selfhood. It can be used with verbal types of prayer in an integrative practice, since tongue-speaking and verbal prayer are mutually complementary. In order to explain this theory, I first developed a nontheological, phenomenological understanding of tongue-speaking. After concluding that tongue-speaking is not language in and of itself, I argued that it still can and does function as prayer, for the purpose mentioned earlier in this paragraph.

However, it is not my intention to imply that tongue-speaking is the only means of shaping a practice of integrative prayer. It is evident to me that a vital need exists in the Church for encouragement

of, engagement in, and experimentation with styles of integrative prayer. Hints of how that might work with tongue-speaking are evident in Chapter Three. There are other available possibilities which have yet to be tested by our community of faith. The following section examines four of these and suggests their potential function as part of an integrative prayer style.

Before proceeding, however, two points derived from the philosophical discussion need always to be reiterated. One is the importance of belief structures to how one interprets experience. The way in which one perceives God, selfhood and the world vastly affects how one understands what can and does happen in one's life. Morton T. Kelsey, an Episcopal priest and student of Jung, illustrates this point with respect to the spiritual realm of the unconscious which the dream expresses: "Unless men believe that there is such a realm of reality which can be experienced, they will probably not look very hard for meaning beyond the material world."[1] The second point is that there is no absolute ontological or epistemological division between realms of knowledge, such as between psychology and theology. This does not, of course, imply that there are no distinctions at all. However, in response to the possible objection that I am applying secular knowledge to theological matters, I contend that, for the process thinker, truth is truth. Whatever is verified in experience about any aspect of reality can and should be grist for the mill of Christian faith. This view of knowledge and experience has guided my work here.

---

[1]Morton T. Kelsey, God, Dreams, and Revelation (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974), p. 11.

II. MORE WAYS TO DEVELOP AN INTEGRATIVE PRAYER STYLE

A. Meditation and meditation techniques

It is common knowledge in our time that very old meditative traditions exist in virtually all the major religions of the world. Some of them, of course, have been more important in influencing the overall shape of their particular religion than others. The point is that meditation is universal, even though there is great diversity in its expressions and modes. In Christian tradition, names such as Meister Eckhart, St. John of the Cross, and Theresa of Avila are associated with meditation.

Claudio Naranjo, a psychologist, has attempted to understand meditation both in terms which go beyond any of the particular forms and in a typology based on psychological nature.[2] He admits that it is not easy to describe meditation (page 7). However, he ventures to describe it as some kind of procedure which aims to develop a "presence" of sorts (pages 7-8). It is difficult for teachers to convey what is "the right attitude" for practicing meditation (page 8). This may be because all meditation is "a dwelling upon something." (page 10) This dwelling is both the way and the destination, so to speak (page 9); it does not happen all at once but is a "process" of "progressive refinement." (page 12)

Naranjo distinguishes three types of meditation. One type is

---

[2]Claudio Naranjo and Robert E. Ornstein, On the Psychology of Meditation (New York: Viking Press, 1971), p. 4. Page numbers in parentheses for the meditation section refer to this book.

known as "concentrative" or "absorptive," because it uses an object upon which one fixes one's attention. Naranjo calls this type "an exercise of attention . . . . a practice in centeredness . . . ." (page 22) It is related to the sense of emptiness, in that "awareness is receptivity, and 'inner silence' must be created before real concentration takes place" (page 22). This type of meditation (or any other) must not be confused with thought processes, however, for meditation "dwells upon" rather than "thinks about" (page 41). It is more important that one have the right attitude and correct guidance than that one simply repeat an exercise (page 46). The purpose of all this is to get oneself out of the way of the "great blower," as one Chinese tradition puts it (page 25). It is interesting to note the similarity between this latter idea and one in the Apostle Paul's writings, as expressed in Romans 8:26 ("we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words") and in I Corinthians 14:14 ("For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful").

A second type of meditation can be called "the negative way." Naranjo believes that it is the undergirding for the other two types, besides being a type on its own basis (page 75). The essence of the negative way is conveyed by the idea of "letting go of. . .": not allowing any habits, ideas, or other limiting factors to become attached to oneself during meditation. Its typical style is "bare attention," a condition of the mind, so to speak, which fixes itself to no items of consciousness (page 86). The negative way often implies a maya (illusion) worldview, though this is not necessary.

The "way of surrender" or "self-expression" is the third of Naranjo's meditative types. It is, in character, a giving up _to_ something (page 90). As with detachment, the way of self-expression becomes a receptivity, an "openness to experience" (page 95). It is a way to improve one's discernment of one's inner voices: "Just as in life we grow by outgrowing, and we outgrow by living something out completely, our perceptions may be refined by giving into our inner voices to the fullest degree." (page 92) The common form of the way of surrender in many religions, Naranjo states, is that of possession, and he briefly discusses some examples, especially shamanism (pages 95ff). One might note that this type of meditation is, of the three, most similar to tongue-speaking.

How can meditation be a part of an integrative prayer style? The answer to this question can be seen in a statement early in Naranjo's book, in which he summarizes many of his ideas about meditation:

> . . . the state we call wakefulness is in large measure of an inhibiting nature, so that our ordinary mental operations actively preclude or limit the occurrance of states such as those pursued in meditation. If we are able to accomplish nothing more than a stilling of the mind, bringing the goal-directed activity of our ordinary state of consciousness to a standstill, separating temporarily from our ego functions (and still retain consciousness), we may enter an altogether unfamiliar domain of experience without ever having sought it _positively_ (i.e., approached it as a goal known through symbolical or conceptual formulations). (page 18)

The key point in this passage centers upon 'entering an unfamiliar domain of experience.' I have contended that a great need exists for prayer to be understood and practiced as an integrative means, that is, taking into account all aspects of selfhood. Popular views of Christian faith have much need to integrate the psychical (in the sense of

"soul"), bodily and action-oriented expressions of selfhood. To do
this, the practitioner will be entering "an altogether unfamiliar do-
main of experience." If meditative techniques can help a person do
this, as Naranjo claims, then it is quite appropriate for Christians to
consider a meditative technique as one way in which they can develop an
integrative prayer style.

To clarify what I mean here, one should not suppose that any
meditation technique is an integrative prayer style. The case with
meditation, as with the other ways discussed later in this chapter, is
the same as for tongue-speaking. By itself, it is not likely to con-
stitute fully integrative prayer. There is probably no one form of
prayer that can do this, since prayer is essentially 'multidimensional.'
The major point is that the types discussed in this chapter, like
tongue-speaking, give prominence to the nonconscious aspects of self-
hood, which have been almost completely ignored in Western culture, and
especially in Western Christianity.

There is a necessary qualification to the use of these tech-
niques which is the same as with tongue-speaking. The integrative ef-
ficacy of any such technique is significantly enhanced by the practi-
tioner's conscious aim to be aware of all aspects of selfhood and to
aim for their integration.[3] Again I emphasize the crucial value of be-
lief structure and desire. Even so, some degree of integration and/or
benefit is derived by the practitioner regardless of his/her vision of
reality.

------

[3]See Chapter One, section IV, for the discussion of why and how
conscious aim is important.

B. Study of one's own dreams

While meditation has a recognizable history, continuous up to the current time, the religious use of dreams greatly diminished during the past several centuries. A secular-based resurgence of interest, however, has come out of psychological research and its findings concerning the dream's relationship to one's waking state.[4] Earlier in this century, the famous psychiatrist C. G. Jung was developing psychological theories which relied very significantly upon the nature and content of dreaming.[5] Jung used a client's dreams to help understand the fulness of the client's psychological situation and hence to aid therapy.[6] The combined influence of Jung's work and modern research has led to a current growing interest and practice, in some circles at least, of using dreams as an aid to personal growth. Can such a practice benefit Christians who are desiring an integrative prayer style? I believe that it can.

Dreams have, in past times and cultures, been an important factor in people's lives, especially with regard to religious matters. I need not argue the case for this statement here; Morton T. Kelsey has already provided the evidence.[7] A summary of his work will help us

---

[4]I am referring here to study of rapid-eye-movements (REMs) and other dream phenomena, which has been undertaken in laboratory settings over the past fifteen years or so.

[5]For Jung's use of his own dreams in his personal development, see Memories, Dreams, Reflections (New York: Vintage, 1973).

[6]See, e.g., Two Essays on Analytical Psychology (New York: Pantheon, 1953).

[7]Kelsey. Page references to this section are to this book.

understand the current situation. In ancient cultures, the religious value of dreams was almost universally recognized (page 10). For the ancient Hebrews, dreams were (as also in contemporary cultures) a means of revelation which Yahweh their God used as the (sometimes) best or (sometimes) only way to communicate with humans (pages 18-19). Because of fakers, the Hebrews had developed means of critically evaluating any claim to divine guidance through a dream (page 19). The genre was considered to include dreams, visions (these two were not always clearly distinguished), prophecy and angelic visitation (pages 19-22). Examples of these types are numerous in the Old Testament; some of them are in the Abraham story (Genesis 15-21), Jacob (Gen. 28, 31), Joseph (Gen. 37ff), Saul (I Sam. 28:6), David (II Sam. 7:4) and the prophets.

Greek tradition, for the most part, also believed in the religious value of dreams. Plato discusses dreams in his writings and, according to Kelsey, his ideas are in general agreement with those of the Old Testament (pages 60-66). The notable Greek exception is Aristotle, whose philosophical system had no place for reality beyond what is known through sense experience. For him, dreams were a natural phenomenon which had no purpose (pages 67-69). Most other Greek thinkers affirmed dreams essentially in the manner of Plato. The New Testament follows Old Testament notions, with some variations derived from Hellenism (page 100).

This basic core of notions, according to Kelsey's research, continued to be acceptable in the Church until Thomistic theology, based upon Aristotelian thought, began to dominate Christian religious thinking (pages 173-178). The seed for skepticism, even fear, was

planted centuries earlier by Gregory the Great (pages 158-161). His caution about dreams was based partly upon a poor translation of a word in Leviticus, which has subsequently been used as a condemnation of the religious use of dreams. This translation is in the Latin Vulgate prepared by Jerome, whose own life of fear and anger, Kelsey says, probably influenced his translation of this key passage (pages 151-155). Gradually dreams were thought to be insignificant, even though some religious people continued to note clear relationships between their dreaming and waking states (chapter eight).

Today it is again more acceptable to study one's dreams as a means of understanding the wider aspects of oneself. What do we know about why they can help us in this way? Much could be said to answer this question, but a general suggested line of thought is sufficient here. In religious terms, Judaeo-Christian tradition understands dreams as originating in the spiritual world. In secular terms, depth psychology bases dreams in the unconscious, that "boundless sea" on which the "little island," consciousness, floats.[8] Jung once described the unconscious as "the eternally living, creative, germinal layer in each of us: and the dream as "one of the pureset products of unconscious constellation."[9] Both of these explanations are congruous with a process view selfhood, in recognizing both the vastness of the

---

[8]These quoted are in Jolan Jacobi, The Psychology of Jung (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943), p. 5. This book is a very helpful introduction to Jung's thought.

[9]Jung, Collected Works, IV, p. 330 and p. 148. Quoted in Kelsey, p. 200.

unconscious and the guiding immanence of God. If one understands the messages from one's dreams, one is better able to integrate a wider range of selfhood than is known only through consciousness. This viewpoint illustrates the notion that psychological and theological explanations are based upon the same ontological framework; one does not explain away the other.

Accepting the religious dimension of dreams does not, however, demand that one comply with the ancient view of how that divine intervention happened. Process thought understands God's role in human existence as immanental and human existence as vastly complex. God's relationship through dreams is much more subtle than the visual, anthropomorphic terms with which the Bible and most Western writings portray God to the dreamer. Interpreting any dream, especially one which may have a religious message or meaning, is by nature, a fairly sophisticated enterprise.

Yet it is possible to develop skills which make dream interpretation easier. Jung's only rule, according to Kelsey, was to hold off deciding what the dream means until having studied it.[10] Kelsey himself offers direction for gaining the necessary skills.[11] One needs to practice trying to explain dreams, specific ones. Such attempts will then demonstrate that the interpreter needs to have knowledge of the particular dreamer. More important than this, Kelsey says, is for the interpreter to pay attention to his/her own dreams, to understand them. Kelsey also believes that the dream interpreter needs a broad and wise

---

[10]Kelsey, p. 212.   [11]Ibid., pp. 212-14.

understanding of life. Lastly, one needs to have faith in God and a knowledge of religions and myths. The need for this kind of knowledge, according to Kelsey, is based upon Jung's theory of archetypes, which are universal human symbols originating in the collective unconscious.[12]

Kelsey also gives four practical suggestions for learning how to use one's dream experiences seriously.[13] First, one must genuinely want to take on the venture. Otherwise—I speak here from experience-- one will find that the venture simply will not proceed. Second, Kelsey says to begin writing down one's dreams and include them in one's "personal spiritual journal." This is not as easy as it may sound; it might require an earnest adjustment in one's sleeping schedule. The third suggestion concerns the actual interpreting of the dreams. This is the crux of the entire program; it takes practice and the development of one's intuition. Kelsey's last suggestion is to have another person to be one's discussant for one's own dreams. This makes the interpretation process easier, for the dialogue with another person might trigger ideas, images and feelings that did not emerge alone.

Another very helpful source of information and suggestions on personal dream study is Ann Faraday's The Dream Game.[14] Faraday, a clinical psychologist, has detailed chapters telling how to record dreams, how to interpret them (for example, levels of meaning, common

---

[12]For a brief explanation of the collective unconscious, see Jacobi, pp. 20, 30-31, 40-48.

[13]Kelsey, pp. 232-35.

[14]Ann Faraday, The Dream Game (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

symbols and what they might mean, dream themes) and how to benefit from them. She combines her psychological training with helpful illustrations of her points.

How can dream study be part of a person's integrative prayer style? We have seen that it supplies the practitioner with a source of personal 'information' which is not available merely through conscious effort and means. Such knowledge of self, we have also seen, is critical to the scheme of integration which this project presents. Becoming aware of how one's unconscious is functioning is to become more responsive to wider dimensions of life. One's conventional prayer then can become more efficacious, as one prays with greater sensitivity to more aspects of one's life.

Perhaps it appears as though I advocate the use of 'secular' information for enhancing one's spiritual development. By now I think that my view on this matter is clear. It is true that much dream analysis today operates with no traditionally religious background or goal. However, we have seen that, even in this type of situation, God is intimately involved with the person. Faith in God's guidance through all one's milieu of experience will, I contend, make a great difference in how one matures and integrates oneself.

As a discipline, dream study takes learning, practice and time. This may be a limitation to the person who is looking for a fairly easy way to develop an integrative prayer style. Ample testimony exists in any religious tradition, though, to dispute such attempts. Maturity defies ease.

C. Guided imagery meditation

Guided imagery meditation is a third way by which persons may develop an integrative prayer style. This is an old method which is being developed in a variety of ways today. The most well-known method in Christian history is probably found in Ignatius of Loyola's The Spiritual Exercises,[15] which uses "mental prayer" with other "methods of examination," for the purpose "of seeking and finding the will of God in the disposition of our life for the salvation of our soul."[16] Morton Kelsey has written a book on Christian meditation which draws upon the Ignatian style, entitled The Other Side of Silence.[17] Another recent development is Carolyn Stahl's Opening to God: Guided Imagery Meditation on Scripture.[18] It is her style which I will utilize here.

One way to understand what guided imagery meditation is might be to see it as a hybrid of meditation and dream work. As in dreams, the purpose of this practice is to elicit 'visual' experiences in one's mind. What makes it different from dreams is that the person is not sleeping and the experience is guided by a particular set of instructions. These instructions have been prepared ahead of time--often, but not necessarily, by someone else--and focus/limit to one degree or another, the content of the particular meditation. As in meditation,

---

[15]A recent translation is The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1951).

[16]Ibid., p. 1.

[17]Morton Kelsey, The Other Side of Silence (New York: Paulist Press, 1976).

[18]Carolyn Stahl, Opening to God (Nashville: Upper Room, 1977).

the practitioner is in a relaxed state and aims to dwell upon the images, scenes and movement of what enters consciousness. Once the instructions are fulfilled and the meditation ends, it is then very important to do something about what happened in the meditation. Talking with another person, writing down thoughts and feelings in a personal journal, drawing a picture--these activities enhance the influence which the meditation can have on the practitioner, because they bring the experience into focus and make it vivid.

The following meditation is quoted from Stahl's book and illustrates how guided imagery meditation can be used:

Finding a Buried Treasure

Reading: "The kingdom of Heaven is like treasure lying buried in a field. The man who found it, buried it again; and for sheer joy went and sold everything he had, and bought that field."

Biblical Note: The "hidden" treasure (which is already present) is the kingdom of God in this parable. The kingdom of God is so joyful that Jesus believed that a person would give up all else to participate in it.

For Your Meditation: This meditation is primarily focusing upon the treasure. Let yourself be open to any treasure which might appear. . . .

Meditation: Take three slow, deep breaths and let yourself relax . . . Get a sense of yourself walking along a beach. . . . Feel the sand beneath your feet, its temperature and texture. . . . Feel the warmth of the sun radiating upon your body. . . . Pay attention to what is around you on the beach. . . as you walk, notice something that looks like a disturbance in the sand, and push away the sand to find a buried treasure. . . . Do whatever you need to do to uncover that treasure. . . . Now as you open it, become aware of what is hidden within. . . . Spend whatever time you need observing, becoming aware of, talking with or being with that treasure. . . . Let yourself participate in any way you want with that treasure. . . . Be aware of the other things in your life and how they relate to this treasure. . . . What is important? . . . You may encounter Christ and talk about this. . . . If you need to bring in other people or things, do that. . . . Follow through with this treasure in any way that feels right for you now. . . . Find some way to bring back with you a symbol of this treasure. . . . Walk back up

the beach again, aware of the sand, the water, and the warm
sun. . . . When you feel ready, open your eyes.

Comments on Debriefing and Use: The treasure may have been
for you a talent which has lain dormant, a quality which you wish
to develop, a gift which you can give to the world, an awareness
of the "kingdom of God," or any number of other possibilities.
You may find, experiencing this meditation several days in a row,
that you discover several different treasures. Or, you may get
more thoroughly in touch with the same treasure, if that is what
keeps appearing. You may want to limit "the treasure" to a symbol
or awareness of the kingdom of God. The reason I have not done this
here is that the kingdom of God may be an abstract notion to some,
so it is difficult for them to visualize. The notion of "treasure'
usually evokes a very concrete and positive finding, which would
likely be a part of the kingdom.
If you did not find a treasure or if you found nothing within
it, then simply accept that this is what occurred for you just now.
Allow yourself first to understand your feelings in not finding a
treasure. Later you might choose to do the meditation again.

There are many exciting debriefing activities possible for
children in this meditation. You could make a box (or use a shoe
box) and put your hidden treasure within the box in the form of a
picture, a symbol, or in words.[19]

As a technique, guided imagery meditation has many advantages, one of

the most significant being its wide adaptability. Stahl's meditations

are based mainly upon parables and pericopes from the Gospels, but she

encourages readers to develop their own as well. The use of Bible pas-

sages can add a little-used facet to Bible study. Such use can also be

adapted to any number of people, from one to a very large group.

This range of adaptability makes guided imagery meditation a

very good choice for part of an integrative prayer style. It is rela-

tively easy to practice, which will be appealing to some. However, as

with the other ways, this way involves the practitioner at deeper levels

of selfhood. Desire and commitment are important factors to making the

_____

[19]From Stahl, Opening to God, pp. 53-54, used by permission of
author.

practice fruitful in this less conscious realm.

D. Biofeedback

The fourth and last way which we will discuss is biofeedback, the newest and least 'traditional' of the four. Studied by psychologists and medical professionals over the past ten years or so, this scientifically-based recognition of the integral relationship between mental and physiological processes is opening up into many promising directions for a host of therapeutic processes. For the purposes here, it is not important to explain the scientific details of biofeedback, although an overview is necessary.

Does or can the mind control the body? Certainly we know that many of our body's functions depend upon the activity of the mind. Until recently, however, certain physiological processes were considered beyond the control of consciousness; hence, they were termed "involuntary." Since biofeedback study and training began, there is an abundance of evidence which suggests that mental processes can be trained to influence more of the physiological processes than Western science had ever thought possible. I say "Western science" because, as Elmer Green of the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kansas has vividly demonstrated, Indian yogis have for centuries been able to perform activities which astound the Western medical world. In his film, Biofeedback: The Yoga of the West,[20]Green filmed a man sitting on a bed of long, sharp pegs, another man making his heart skip a beat, another

_____

[20]"Biofeedback: The Yoga of the West" (Cos Cob, CT: Hartley, n.d.).

moving "involuntary" abdominal muscles, another staying in a small, sealed box for seven hours and coming out unharmed, and other such "feats."

We do not need to learn any of these unusual experiences in order to benefit from what they tell us is possible for us to do. Barbara B. Brown discusses biofeedback in an interesting and readable style.[21] Its primary areas of influence are the skin, muscles, nerve-muscle cells, heartbeat, blood pressure, and brain waves. Her book is lengthy (464 pages) with bibliography and index, but it clearly shows that the possibilities are present and have been demonstrated by Americans in many kinds of recent experiments.

How does biofeedback training specifically work? In a very important way, biofeedback relies upon the scientific technology of our time, in the form of machines which register particular information about certain functions of the body. A familiar biofeedback instrument is the thermometer, which indicates the internal temperature of the body. Beginning biofeedback training often uses small thermometers to show the trainees how they can change the temperature of their hands by imagining, in a relaxed state, something which makes their hands hot or cold. More sophisticated machines register other, more technical information, from the body's sources listed above. The practitioner uses the information from the machine to gauge her/his success in accomplishing the desired result. Perhaps the most publicized of these results

---

[21]Barbara Brown, New Mind, New Body (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

is achieving a very relaxed state, indicated by emission of alpha waves from the brain.[22]

Biofeedback training is being used in both medical and experimental contexts. Various specialists related to the medical profession are using biofeedback training to help treat conditions which usually rely upon drugs--migraine headaches, other situations of chronic pain, and muscle dysfunction. Other leaders are interested in a broader context and are developing various types of disciplines which integrate certain aspects of life. One such person is Clyde Curran of Claremont, California, a college professor who has led workshops on biofeedback meditation. Another is the Rev. L. Robert Keck of First Community Church, Columbus, Ohio, who leads retreats as part of his special ministry with the Columbus church.

Barbara Brown suggests in her book a number of future possibilities for biofeedback training; some of these she thinks are within the realm of reasonable actualization.[23] They are: knowledge of one's inner state of well-being, ability to control sleep, better communication with one's subconscious, release of tension, reduced use of certain kinds of drugs, and reduced staff time with patients in hospitals and therapy programs. Her convictions, and those of others working in this field, are both an encouragement and a challenge to the Church. If the gospel speaks to the whole of life, the salvation (healing) of the body

------

[22]For a discussion of alpha brain waves, their importance and potentiality, see Brown, chapters 9 and 10.

[23]See Brown's discussion in chapter 12 of her book.

is a serious matter for Christians.

This emphasis upon the body is perhaps the greatest asset which biofeedback training has to offer to an integrative prayer discipline. The development of one or more of these skills brings to the practitioner's attention the conditions and needs of the body, its functions, organs and systems. The inherent interrelatedness of human selfhood for which this project argues is dramatically underscored by the experiences of biofeedback training. The latter's focus is upon the body and the many, complex, unconscious processes of all bodily systems, as well as on the human soul's relationship to these processes. This kind of experience and information can complement one's practice of conscious prayer, especially with regard to petition for needs and gratitude for health. Thus, the potential for biofeedback in integrative prayer is by no means inconsiderable.

E. Comments and contrasts with tongue-speaking

It should be apparent by now that I have identified one major, common feature among the five ways discussed in this project. This feature is the work with the nonconscious (unconscious and/or bodily) aspects of selfhood. By their natures, none of these ways is prayer in itself, in the focused sense, though the affinities are obvious. The possible exception is tongue-speaking. What each one does, in some manner or another, is to aid the process of eliciting feelings and ideas from the unconscious and the body, which may then be dealt with through prayer. This does not imply, however, that clearly conscious prayer is necessarily always the final step or apex to the integrative

process. The point is to improve one's integration, through a style of prayer which can and does deal with all aspects of selfhood.

There seems to be the possibility, as I just suggested, that tongue-speaking may be a bit different than the other ways. At any rate, it is the most traditional in form of the five. The content of tongue-speaking, though not problematic to charismatics, defies simple categorization. Perhaps the best insight as to tongue-speaking's distinctiveness came from the Apostle Paul, who wrote: "When I speak in tongues, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful." (I Cor. 14:14) Agnes Sanford, an Anglican who has been involved for many years in spiritual healing and more recently in the charismatic movement, explains what Paul means:

> Since one is speaking from the unconscious--or, as I would say, from the spirit--one is naturally in closer contact with the Spirit of God than when speaking and thinking through the dull medium of one's own language. Thus the edification comes from Spirit to spirit, and one perceives it through the improved ability to pray, to think to write, or to invent mousetraps. Naturally. The Creator, speaking and operating directly in the unconscious, increases one's creativity.[24]

The 'psychological' reason for this is in bypassing the conscious mind (as I noted in Chapter Three). Sanford continues:

> Tongues when practised in private prayer are largely a way of silencing the conscious mind so that the spirit may be freed to commune directly with God. This is indeed the purpose of all contemplative prayer: to be immersed in God even to the exclusion of words. The conscious mind tries in every way possible to stop this, whether from the interference of the perverse principle within us or from the control habit of the conscious mind I do not know.[25]

---

[24]Agnes Sanford, The Healing Gifts of the Spirit (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966), p. 183.

[25]Ibid., p. 184.

In this way, tongue-speaking as prayer may be a more focused practice, in one sense, than any other of the five. What I attempted to do in Chapter Three was to develop a metaphysically- and psychologically-based explanation for the above theologically-oriented one based upon Paul.

How effective are the four ways of this chapter for getting in touch with those usually unintegrated facets of selfhood? In making a judgment like this, I do not want to appear overly confident about my ability to tell someone else what will or will not be beneficial. It is more a matter of getting a sense of a general range. Meditation, in its ancient and classical forms and techniques, may be most difficult, evidence suggests. It appears that much training and discipline are needed for 'results' to be significant, not to mention their applicability to integrative prayer. Dream study seems less difficult than meditation even though it requires a definite kind of commitment. Interpretation becomes the most challenging part of dream study, I think. Guided imagery meditation is easy to use and requires little training. However, it is not a panacea for self-therapy. As with the others, I feel fairly certain that the deeper, subtler issues of one's life are neither presented nor resolved quickly and easily. Biofeedback is unique because of its direct attention to body. Thus one can expect that it has unique possibilities. It also is fairly easy to begin, because one's success can be measured. As with guided imagery meditation, however, biofeedback can and does move into the complexities of selfhood; these complexities require, as I have stated throughout, more than a fanciful interest.

III. SOME POSSIBILITIES FOR THE CHURCH

It is not my intention, or ability, to prescribe details for how churches can use these different ways in developing integrative prayer styles. I wish to offer possible directions, without favoring one style at the expense of another. Each one has strengths and difficulties.

To begin with, there are some necessary prerequisites for any church which hopes to venture into this area and benefit from it. One obvious, necessary condition is a willingness to experiment. The future is open; the forms of the past are preludes to the newnesses possible for the present. Christians are called to take risks for the sake of the gospel, and this includes all facets of religious life. A second need is more theological than metaphysical. These Christian experiments need to have in them seeds of humility (which will be able to grow) that come from a vivid life of grace. That is, the experimenter trusts and lives in God's grace, not human achievement, while still trying new ways of building faith. Third, these experimenters will be greatly helped by being grasped by a <u>vision</u> of reality which is more <u>consonant</u> with reality. My prejudices (as they should probably be termed) on this matter have been discussed through the course of these chapters. The purpose of such a vision, and its conscious appropriation, is to make one's interpretations of one's experiences as accurate, and thus beneficial, as possible.

Such experimentation will take place better in an atmosphere which fosters this kind of openness. First, a congregation needs to

trust its leadership, which will have approved any proposed program.
The leadership needs to guide and oversee the activities which pertain
to the program. In this way, they can help the experimenters interpret
their experiences, offer ideas and reflections, and so on. This will go
a long way in avoiding any factious developments within the congrega-
tion. Second, those who are leaders of the experiments need to be com-
petent in their skill and at least sensitive to the nature and functions
of the Church. The best situation is when the leader is both very com-
petent in the skill and very committed to Christian faith and its in-
stitutional but creative expressions. This will help the integration of
the skills, which may at first seem secular or even profane, with the
practitioner's growing understanding of Christian faith. By way of re-
minder, the goal of prayer is not some static attainment of an ideal-
ized perfection. Because life is always in process, prayer (especially
integrative prayer) aims to harmonize and intensify each moment as fully
as possible, knowing that future events bring their own challenges and
require new ways of response and of more complex integration.

In addressing charismatics who may wish to use tongue-speaking
in an integrative prayer style, I have two comments. The first is
that, as I have discussed it in Chapter Three, tongue-speaking can still
be a form of prayer even when the utterance itself is not considered
identifiable language. Second, to make tongue-speaking integrative,
the practitioner needs to believe in the desirability of such integra-
tion and in the efficacy which tongue-speaking can have in gaining such
integration. This is important, again, because of the influence which
belief structures have on how we interpret our experience and, hence,

what we believe is possible to experience.

By considering four aspects of church life, it is possible to suggest in more detail how a church may do its experimenting. The starting point might most appropriately be in Christian Education. It is certainly necessary to include experimentation in this function of the church's life. A good way to start is to offer a series of some kind, on a six-week Sunday evening basis. For starters, a Biblically-oriented series may be safest and appeal to more people. Because dreams are abundant in the Bible, a series could be "Biblical Dreaming: Study and Practice." The title indicates both a cognitive and an experiential approach. For a tradition-oriented congregation, a series like "Christian Meditation: History and Practice" might be a less threatening way to introduce an integrative prayer style. Another series, for those not threatened by nontraditional activities, could be something like, "Your Body is You: Integrating our Ignored Wisdom." A balance between teaching, discussing and doing will help the experimenters appreciate the rational, participatory and experiential dimensions of their newly-learned skills. Showing the relationships to the Church's traditions, past and present, is also valuable. The main goal at this introductory level is to shape the perspective needed for approaching integrative prayer, while also providing enough experience to engender a feeling of accomplishment and a desire to continue.

As the focus of Christian life, worship is a most important arena for some experimentation. Respect for the congregation's tradition will demand a slower pace in some instances, but it will perhaps keep more people interested longer. Knowledge of the people's ability

to accept novelty is essential in deciding what to try. Guided imagery meditation may be the easiest to use in worship, because it is so adaptable and probably the least threatening. For more information, see Stahl's Opening to God, chapter three.

Pastoral care is a part of ministry which may be the easiest for introducing integrative ideas, suggestions and practicies. As a profession, pastoral care has developed in large part out of secular models of counseling. Some professional pastoral counselors already utilize some of these new ways. It is probably true, though, that pastoral counseling's attention to their relevance for prayer is an area for considerable growth. The field holds much promise, I surmise, because parishioners who seek pastoral care are, in effect, seeking that which integrative prayer offers. Areas of particular need and opportunity are hospital and crisis counseling. I suggest that the pastor of the church be familiar with several of these new ways but know and use one of them regularly.

The mission of the church has been conceptually problematic, especially in its diverse expression during the last century or so. This aspect of integration, as was defined in Chapter One, may appear to have been most neglected in this project. It is not my intention to do so. In speaking to mission, one central goal is to show how integration is focally that for which all mission aims. A catchy-phrased series in this regard might be "Prayer and Mission, or, How Can My Prayers Make Any Difference to What Happens in the World?" Of course, the leader had better have some helpful answers to a nitty-gritty question like that! I hope that the overall perspective has been made

clear in this project. I now hope that others will develop creative
ways to help parishioners understand that what they do affects others
as well as themselves. This wider-based approach will change the face
of both evangelistic and ethical considerations. Through such experi-
ences, leaders can hope that the meaning of mission will become compre-
hensive and vivid for the participants. They will be able to learn
that the true purpose of helping oneself mature in spirit, soul, body
and action is to help others do the same. Perhaps, then, the "brief
Galilean vision of humility" will not, as Whitehead wrote, "flicker
throughout the ages, uncertainly,"[26] but may burn brighter in our time
and beyond.

---

[26]Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York: Macmillan, 1929),
p. 520.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beare, Frank W. "Speaking with Tongues: A Critical Survey of the NT Evidence." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII:3 (September 1964), 229-246.

Betz, Hans Dieter (ed.) Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

"Biofeedback: The Yoga of the West." Cat Rock Road, Cos Cob, CT., 06807: Hartley, n.d.

Brown, Barbara. New Mind, New Body: Biofeedback: New Directions for the Mind. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Brown, William Adams. The Life of Prayer in a World of Science. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.

Campenhausen, Hans von. Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries., trans. by J. A. Baker. London: Black, 1969.

Cargas, Harry James, and Bernard Lee (eds.) Religious Experience and Process Theology. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Christenson, Larry. Speaking in Tongues and its Significance for the Church. Minneapolis: Dimension, 1968.

Clark, Elmer T. The Small Sects in America, rev. ed. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Cobb, John B., Jr. A Christian Natural Theology, based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

_____. Is It Too Late? A Theology of Ecology. Beverly Hills: Bruce, 1972.

_____. Liberal Christianity at the Crossroads. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973.

Conzelmann, Hans. I Corinthians: A Commentary, trans. by James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Cutten, George Barton. Speaking with Tongues: Historically and Psychologically Considered. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927.

Eliade, Mircea. Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy, trans. by Willard R. Trask. New York: Pantheon, 1964.

Faraday, Ann. The Dream Game. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Ford, J. Massingberd. "Toward a Theology of 'Speaking in Tongues'." Theological Studies, XXXII:1 (March 1971), 3-29.

Gelpi, Donald L. Pentecostalism: A Theological Viewpoint. New York: Paulist Press, 1971.

Goodman, Felicitas. "The Apostolics of Yucatan," in Erika Bourguinon (ed.) Religion, Altered States of Consciousness, and Social Change. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1973.

_____. Speaking in Tongues: A Cross-Cultural Study of Glossolalia. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Hamilton, Michael P. (ed.) The Charismatic Movement. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Heard, Gerald. A Preface to Prayer. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944.

Hine, Virginia H. "Pentecostal Glossolalia--Toward a Functional Interpretation," in Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi (ed.) Research in Religious Behavior: Selected Readings. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1973.

Jacobi, Jolan, The Psychology of Jung. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.

Jorstad, Erling (ed.) The Holy Spirit in Today's Church: A Handbook of the New Pentecostalism. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973.

Jung, Carl Gustav. Memories, Dreams, Reflections, recorded and edited by Aniela Jaffé, trans. by Richard and Clara Winston, rev. ed. New York: Vintage, 1973.

_____. Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, trans. by R. F. C. Hull. New York: Vintage, 1953.

Käsemann, Ernst. Essays on New Testament Themes, trans. by W. J. Montague. Naperville: Allenson, 1964.

Kelsey, Morton T. God, Dreams, and Revelation: A Christian Interpretation of Dreams, revised paperback ed. of Dreams: Dark Speech of the Spirit. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974.

_____. The Other Side of Silence: A Guide to Christian Meditation. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

_____. Tongue Speaking: An Experiment in Spiritual Experience. Garden City: Doubleday, 1964.

Kildahl, John P. The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich (eds.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968. 10 vols.

Magee, John. Reality and Prayer: A Guide to the Meaning and Practice of Prayer. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Merton, Thomas. Contemplative Prayer. Garden City: Doubleday, 1969.

Mills, Watson. Understanding Speaking in Tongues. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Naranjo, Claudio, and Robert E. Ornstein. On the Psychology of Meditation. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Ornstein, Robert E. The Psychology of Consciousness. New York: Penguin Books, 1975 (San Francisco: Freeman, 1972).

Pittenger, W. Norman. God's Way With Men. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1969.

_____. The Holy Spirit. Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1974.

_____. Praying Today. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Puglisi, Mario. Prayer, trans. by Bernard W. Allen. New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Ranaghan, Kevin and Dorothy. Catholic Pentecostalism. New York: Paulist Press, 1969.

Samarin, William J. Tongues of Men and Angels: The Religious Language of Pentecostalism. New York: Macmillan, 1972.

Sanford, Agnes. The Healing Gifts of the Spirit. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966.

_____. The Healing Light. St. Paul: Macalester Park, 1947.

Schutz, John Howard. "Charisma and Social Reality in Primitive Christianity." Journal of Religion, LIV:1 (January 1974), 51-70.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity, ed. and intro. by Ulrich Neuenschwander, trans. by L. A. Garrard. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.

The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius: A New Translation, by Louis J. Puhl. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1951.

Stagg, Frank, E., Glenn Hinson, and Wayne Oates. Glossolalia: Tongue Speaking in Biblical, Historical and Psychological Perspective. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967.

Stahl, Carolyn. Opening to God: Guided Imagery Meditation on Scripture. Nashville: Upper Room, 1977.

Tugwell, Simon. "The Gift of Tongues in the New Testament." Expository Times, LXXXIV:5 (February 1973), 137-140.

United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. General Assembly. Report of the Special Committee on the Work of the Holy Spirit. Philadelphia: 1970.

Ward, Barbara and Rene Dubos. Only One Earth: The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Whitehead, Alfred North. Modes of Thought. New York: Free Press, 1966.

_____. Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology. New York: Macmillan, 1929.

_____. Religion in the Making. New York: Meridian, 1960.

_____. Science and the Modern World. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Williams, Cyril. "Ecstaticism in Hebrew prophecy and Christian Glossolalia." Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses, III:4 (1973/4), 320-338.

Williams, J. Rodman. The Era of the Spirit. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International, 1971.

Yungblut, John R. Rediscovering Prayer. New York: Seabury Press, 1972.